

Towards Home Rule

Part II

"We are convinced that there is only one form of government, whatever it may be called, namely, where the ultimate control is in the hands of the people."—*A. J. Balfour.*

EDITED AND PARTLY WRITTEN

BY

Ramananda Chatterjee, M.A.,

Editor of "*The Prabasi*" and "*The Modern Review*."

SECOND EDITION

Revised.

Calcutta
Modern Review Office
1917

26.3
CALCUTTA :

Printed by A. C. Sarkar, at B. M. Press,
211, Cornwallis Street ;

Published by R. Chatterjee,
210-3-1, Cornwallis Street.

First Editon 1000, June, 1917.

Second Edition, 2,000, November, 1917.

A52254072
C22272

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Evolution and Revolution in Science and Civic Life	1
Social and Political Evolution	5
The Problem of Race Equality ..	9
The Alleged Inferiority of the Coloured Races, I	23
The Alleged Inferiority of the Coloured Races, II	36
The Place of India in the Brotherhood of Nations	55
Home Rule Among Savages in the British Empire	65
Public Administration in Ancient India ...	70
Municipal Institutions in Ancient India ...	76
Ancient Village Government in Southern India ...	83
Race Superiority	87
Civic Elements in Indian Life ...	91
Our Unity in Diversity	95
A Japanese Paper on the Indian Struggle for Self-rule	97
Our Fitness for Home Rule	99
British Capitalists and Indian Home Rule ...	100
The Rationale of Autonomy ...	102
Home Rule and the Super-Brahmanas ...	114

EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION IN SCIENCE AND CIVIC LIFE

The doctrine of Evolution is a very old one. It was known to the ancient philosophers of India and Greece and also to some of the poets of ancient Europe. But although it is an old doctrine, it has been clearly enunciated only since the middle of the nineteenth century. In its present form the doctrine is associated with the name of Darwin. It has been attempted to apply it equally to the physical, animal, vegetable, and even mineral worlds. Of every branch of science—mental, moral and physical, it has been considered to be a fundamental conception.

For over a quarter of a century, the doctrine as enunciated and elucidated by Darwin held its ground almost quite unchallenged—being accepted by the leading scientists of every country of the West. But since the last two decades or so, there have been some scientists who do not accept Darwinism in its entirety. Evolution according to Darwin may be defined to be continuous variation brought about by several circumstances. But there are now several scientists who hold that continuous variation does not satisfactorily account for all the phenomena of Evolution. Francis Galton, in his paper on "Discontinuity in Evolution," published in *Mind*, Vol. III, believes in spurts or sudden leaps being "competent to mould races without any help whatever from the process of selection, whether natural or sexual."

Again in the same paper, referring to discontinuous or what he calls transilient variation, he says :—

"A leap has taken place into a new position of stability. I am unable to conceive the possibility of Evolutionary progress except by transiliences, for, if they were mere divergences, each subsequent generation would tend to regress backward toward the typical centre, and the advance which has been made would be temporary and could not be maintained."

Another writer, Mr. William Bateson, believes that discontinuous variations are the all-important means of organic evolution.

It is not necessary to quote other scientific authors whose expressed views coincide with the above. Evolution in the Darwinian sense of the term would not satisfactorily explain the phenomena of geological formations. Thus, for instance, we may conceive as possible the formation of a mountain by the piling up of atoms of sand or earth being accomplished in the course of centuries or thousands—or may be, millions of centuries. The formation of a mountain by the above process is quite possible. But it may be definitely stated that as a matter of fact no mountain was ever formed by the above process. The above process may account for the formation of mounds or hillocks, but not of mountains. Mountains are brought into existence by the sudden or steady upward pressure of underground forces and not by a slow process of accumulations.

The Darwinian theory of Evolution would not also satisfactorily account for the progress of human society. To a certain extent social progress may be achieved by evolution. But it does not reach its highest development by that process. As underground pressure lifts a mountain to its eminence, so a society reaches its height by a process analogous to the play of underground forces or volcanic eruption. That process is revolution. Prince Kropotkin, the Russian exile and revolutionist, defines revolution to be "rapid evolution," for he says that—

"Revolutions—that is, periods of accelerated rapid evolution and rapid changes—are as much in the nature of human society as the slow evolution which incessantly goes on now among the civilised races of mankind. And each time that such a period of accelerated evolution and reconstruction on a grand scale begins, civil war is liable to break out on a small or large scale."

According to Edgar Quinet—

"Great revolutions are the prominent and enduring landmarks on the highway of the world, far raised above all surrounding

- *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*, p. 290.

objects, pointing to the progress not of particular nations but of the human race."

But while attention has been paid to the study of the laws which govern evolution, no attempt has yet been made to study the circumstances which bring about revolutions.

When human society has evolved, that is, made progress to a certain extent, and when some ferment has been introduced into it, the further progress of society does not follow the line of "continuous variation," but of "discontinuous variation," that is, of sudden leaps. The ferment may be generated within or introduced from without. The ferment is of the shape of a high ideal, it may be religious, political, or social. The revolution takes place when there is no safety-valve for the escape of the gases generated by the action of the ferment. The proper name for the social safety-valve is *Liberty*. Prof. Sheldon Amos, in his treatise on the Science of Law, says that

"Liberty, in itself, is a negative term denoting absence of restraints; on its positive side it denotes the fullness of individual existence."

It is when liberty in any sphere of life is curtailed, or the safety-valve closed, that the occurrence of a revolution becomes possible. For, to quote the above-mentioned jurist, liberty

"implies rest, meditation, imagination, slow and steady culture of the faculties, combinations and associations for all sorts of purposes and especially that slowly formed belief in the certain power of carrying resolutions into action on which so much of human greatness depends.

From their very nature, revolutions have not been generally accomplished without violence, because they mean a resistance to existing circumstances, and they try to restore liberty. The French Revolution is often used as an illustration of a typical revolution, for it swept away every vestige of the old. Kingsley, speaking of the French Revolution, says:—

"But, side by side with the death, there was manifold fresh birth; side by side with the decay there was active growth; side

by side with them, fostered by them, though generally in strong opposition to them, whether conscious or unconscious."

Again, he says that the French Revolution proclaimed the doctrine that—

"In each man there is a God-given individuality, an independent soul, which no government or man has a right to crush, or can crush, in the long run."

But "discontinuous variation" in social or political progress does not necessarily mean revolution. It is a sudden leap "competent to mould races without any help whatever from the process of selection."

Sir Henry Howorth, K.C.I.E., in his address delivered as president at the Shrewsbury meeting of the Archæological Institute, July 24, 1894, and printed in *The Antiquary*, London, September, 1894, said :—

"We talk of a Stone age, of a Bronze age, and of an Iron age, and these are excellent terms when we apply them to some particular area, like Scandinavia, to which they were first applied ; but they are misleading when universally applied. Many savages are still living, or were quite recently, in the Stone Age, the Shell age or the Wooden age.....while alongside of them were living the emigrants from Europe, who were not only living in the Iron age, but had learned to harness steam to iron, and to multiply human labor tenfold. Not only so, but it is obvious in such cases that *there may be a great jump in civilisation from a very low to a very high step on the ladder without the necessity, or the possibility even, of intermediate steps.* A Bronze age or a Copper age is not at all likely to intervene between the hewers of rude stones or of polished stones in the Pacific and in many parts of America and their adoption of iron....."

Well, this is a very good illustration of what may be properly called 'discontinuous variation' in the evolution of civilization.

Great stress should be laid on "discontinuous variation" as a means of progress ; for in India, Anglo-Indians are never tired of telling the people of this country that they are not yet fitted to enjoy the representative or parliamentary form of Government, because they have not passed through all those stages of society which England and other countries of Europe have done. Taking it for granted that their statement of facts is accurate, it is necessary to remind them that Evolution does not necessarily

mean "continuous variations." It also means "discontinuous variations"—a fact which was not lost sight of even by Darwin himself.

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL EVOLUTION

One often hears Anglo-Indians say that the people of India have not yet *evolved* sufficiently to be fit for representative government. Those who say so do not seem to fully understand what they mean by "Evolution". To quote an American author :—

"There have always been words in our language which, because they covered a great deal of ground, and because we knew very little about the ground they covered, have proved convenient labels behind which to mask ignorance. Not long ago everything that we did not understand about the influence of one mind upon another we called 'magnetism'; now that we know enough about magnetism to make this no longer possible, we call it 'telepathy'. So of old, whenever any man desired to denounce a custom or a law without being able to say why, he characterised it as, 'contrary to Nature'; to-day it is more the fashion to say that it is contrary to the principles of 'Evolution'; not because of a laudable desire to avoid the contradictions contained in the word 'nature', but rather because the word evolution sounds more modern and more wise." P. 13 of Kelly's *Government or Human Evolution*.

Further on the same writer says :—

".....Evolution has become unfortunately synonymous in the minds of many readers with that of development, and, alas! evolution is often the diametrical opposite of development. Development includes the idea of improvement; evolution includes both the idea of improvement and that of degeneration. Development includes the idea of progress from simple to complex function—from the single cell of the protozoon to the multitudinous cells of man. Evolution, on the contrary, includes the idea of degeneration from the large-winged birds that flew over vast sea spaces to the small-winged birds, which, perhaps because they inhabited islands so far out to sea that flight was dangerous, gradually lost their wings by disuse; from the fish with eyes of our surface rivers to the fish without eyes of the caves of Kentucky.

"But evolution involves even more degeneration than this, for if the environment be sufficiently unfavorable, the degeneration proceeds to the point of destruction, as in the Arctic regions, where moss alone survives,..... And it is interesting to note how it is that evolution has erroneously come to be synonymous with development. Evolution is not unlike the famous duellist, who, being charged upon his death-bed to forgive his enemies, answered, "I have killed them all." But she is more hypocritical, for she holds up to our admiration her few successes and spreads her skirts before her many failures ; and so, inasmuch as we have before our eyes only those forms of life which have graduated from Nature's uncanny school in an environment which has been propitious to advancement, we associate progress and development with evolution, forgetting that, in less propitious environments, the lifeless desert and the eternal snow tell a different story." Kelly's *Government or Human Evolution*, pp. 66-67.

EVOLUTION OF NATURE AND OF MAN.

That there is difference between the evolution of Nature and that of man has been very clearly pointed out by the above-mentioned writer :—

"The kingdom of Nature is governed by the law of evolution ; the kingdom of man by the law of effort ; and effort is best exercised through the faculty which man has developed of resisting certain tendencies in Nature, and creating an environment not only different from, but opposed to, that furnished by Nature alone." P. 120.

Again he writes :—

"The evolution of Nature involves the lapse of interminable years ; that of man may, if wise enough, be shortened by effort." P. 348.

EVOLUTION, DARWINIAN AND MODERN.

In the paper on "Evolution and Revolution in Science and Politics" we have pointed out that the Darwinian idea of evolution is not the creed of the scientists of to-day. Thus to quote De Vries :—

"One of the greatest objections to the Darwinian theory of descent arises from the length of time it would require if all evolution was to be explained on the ground of slow and nearly invisible changes. This difficulty is at once met and fully surmounted by the hypothesis of periodical but sudden and quite noticeable steps. This assumption requires only a limited number of mutative periods, which might well occur within the time

allowed by physicists and geologists for the existence of animal and vegetable life on the earth." *

UNCONSCIOUS GROWTH AND VOLUNTARY CONSTRUCTION.

But human society is not so much the outcome of growth as of construction. So, to quote the American writer Kelly again :

"Growth is easy, construction is difficult. Growth belongs to Nature ; construction to Art. Growth is accomplished for us ; construction is accomplished only by ourselves. Construction is the gospel of effort ; growth is the gospel of *laissez fair*." *Ibid*, pp. 257-258.

If human society is the result of construction, so is human government.

"Human government is purposive, not merely instinctive. It is the result of intellectual effort, not that of mere habit ; and it is intellectual effort engaged in making its own environment and no longer the unconscious result of the environment furnished by Nature." P. 213.

In the state of Nature, if the environment be favorable, then there is progress, if unfavorable, then there is degeneration. But in the case of man,

".....it is by *resisting* the environment that man has attained those qualities of mind and heart which differentiate him from other animals, and not by yielding to it ; and man progresses on the principle of resistance and not on that of adaptation. Evolution produced the ape ; effort has produced man." P. 93.

It is not so much by evolution as by effort that social progress takes place. The same writer has pointed out that—

"Society is not an organism.

"It differs from an organism in the following essential particulars :

"The units of an organism have no individual existence ; they are parts essential to the whole and exist for the sake of the whole.

"The units of a society have an individual existence.

"How nearly a government can attain perfection, depends

* *Species And Varieties, Their Origin by Mutation*, by Hugo De Vries, Chicago, The Open Court Publishing Company, 1905, p. 29.

upon the individual character of those subject to it; and how nearly the individual character can attain perfection depends to a great extent upon the government to which it is subjected. These two factors cannot be treated apart: one is a function of the other."

And so even if it be taken for granted that we have not "evolved" sufficiently in the right direction to be fit for even a qualified form of self-government, our Government is to blame to a very great extent for such a state of things.

PROGRESS AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS.

There can be no progress unless the economic conditions of a society are bettered. The celebrated founder of continental socialism Karl Marx's proposition was

"that in every historical epoch the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which it is built up, and from which alone can be explained the political and intellectual history of that epoch."

Again, he wrote:—

"Social life at any one time is the result of an economic evolution."

Demolins, a French writer, maintains that the majority of different racial characteristics are the results of socio-economic changes, which are themselves referable to physico-economic causes.

Prof. Seligman also writes that

"The more civilized the society, the more ethical is its mode of life. But to become more civilized, to permit the moral ideals to percolate through continually lower strata of the population, we must have an economic basis to render it possible. With every improvement in the material condition of the great mass of the population there will be an opportunity for the unfolding of a higher moral life; but not until the economic conditions of society become far more ideal will the ethical development of the individual have a free field for limitless progress." Seligman's *Economic Interpretation of History*, p. 132.

"* * * in the records of the past the moral uplift of humanity has been closely connected with its social and economic progress and that the ethical ideals of the community, which can alone bring about any lasting advance in civilization, have been

erected on and rendered possible by, the solid foundation of material prosperity." *Ibid*, pp. 133-134.

What progress or social evolution for the better is possible under the present depressed economic condition of the Indian people? Writes Seligman:

"If history teaches anything at all, it is that the economic changes transform society by slow and gradual steps."

The contention of our Anglo-Indian friends then that Indian society has not *evolved* to be fit for representative government has no legs to stand upon. It is absurd to prophesy that Indians will be fit for such a government after 500 years. If in nature evolution is accomplished by mutation, in human society progress takes place by "effort" and "revolution" in the sense of rapid development; for if it be true, as Prof. Seligman in his *Economic Interpretation of History* (p. 129) writes, that—

"all progress consists in the attempt to realize the unattainable,—the ideal, the morally perfect."

it can only be effected by effort and not by involuntary evolution. And as the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy cannot be expected to substantially help our effort at conscious development, we must be prepared to rely on our own unaided efforts, and prepared to withstand all open and secret attempts to obstruct our progress.

THE PROBLEM OF RACE EQUALITY

By G. SPILLER.

Hon. Organizer of the Universal Races Congress.

"Backward" does not necessarily mean "inferior".—*Ratzel*.

It is generally conceded that we should be considerate to all races of men regardless of their capacities; but there is equal agreement, and rightly so, that we should be considerate to domesticated ani-

mals, for instance. Here, then, is our dilemma ; for the most considerate of men, if he is sane, will not treat his horse exactly as he treats his compatriot, e.g., he will not expect both of them to converse, to reflect, to fashion and to obey the laws. Accordingly, considerate actions have to be adapted to the nature of the being we have dealings with, and if some races of men should prove to be very decidedly inferior to other races in inherited capacity, it is evident that they would have to be treated apart to a very considerable degree, being excluded, perhaps, from all important functions in the community. This, of course, would not preclude our loving them tenderly and doing everything which conduced to their welfare.

Now, since it is hotly contended that "the negro is not a human being at all, but merely a different form of ox or ass, and is, therefore, only entitled to such kindness as a merciful man shows to all his cattle," and since this is as warmly contested by the negroes and other races concerned, it becomes a vital matter to grapple with the problem of race equality. Especially is this important because many races are actually being treated, or even mal-treated, as inferiors, without any strong presumption in favor of the alleged race-inferiority. If to this be added the all-too-ready tendency to regard other races than our own as "inferior races", and to force these into becoming our hewers of wood and drawers of water, it is manifest that there is urgent need for some light to be thrown on the subject.

Moreover, if the brotherhood of man is to become a reality, as poets and prophets have fondly dreamed, and if the great nations of the world, irrespective of race, are to create a World Tribunal and a World Parliament, it is indispensable that the leading varieties of mankind shall be proved substantially equals. A parliament composed of human beings very widely differing in capacity is a palpable absurdity only realisable in *Alice in Wonderland*. Firmin, seeing the bearing of this, wisely remarks,

"Les races, se reconnaissant egales, pourront se respecter et s'aimer" (De l'Egalite des Races Humaines, 1885, p. 659).

However, we need not include in our problem every tribe and race whatsoever, but only the vast aggregate of mankind, say, China, Japan, Turkey, Persia, India, Egypt, Siam, the Negro, the American Indian, the Philippino, the Malay, the Maori, and the fair-white and dark-white races. These constitute, perhaps, nine-tenths of the human race. If an insignificant people here and there, say the Veddahs or the Andamanese, the Hottentots or the Dyaks, should be shown to be unquestionably inferior, this would constitute no grave inter-racial problem. The rare exception would prove the rule, and the broad rule would make the reality of the rare exception doubtful.

A century ago the issue we are discussing might have been very difficult of approach. Our knowledge of other races was then a negligible quantity, and of most of the important races we had no compelling evidence of higher aptitudes. This is altered now. We know almost intimately the various great peoples, and fortunately there exists to-day a common standard by which we can measure them at least in one respect. This standard is supplied by the University. As a mere matter of theory it is conceivable that not one non-Caucasian should be capable of graduating at a University, and it is even possible to conceive that a number of peoples should not be able to force their way through the elementary school. The data, however, favour no such conclusion, for individuals of all the select races which we have mentioned above have graduated in modern Universities and in diverse subjects.* To appreciate this statement, especially in the light of

* Certain inquiries at European universities where Asiatic and African students are to be found, tend to show that there is no good reason for thinking that they possess less ability than European students.

disparaging remarks to the effect that the facial angle of certain races more nearly approaches that of apes than that of Caucasians, we must remember that not a solitary ape has yet been known to have reached the stage of being able to pass the entrance examination to an infant school or kindergarten. We must agree with Ratzel, who says, "There is only one species of man; the variations are numerous, but do not go deep."

An objector might argue that the academic member of an inferior race is a shining exception, a freak of nature, and that from his feat nothing can be deduced regarding the average capacity of his race. This theoretical objection can be disposed of in various ways. We might meet it with the irresistible contention that no member of any species departs far from the average, for else a lioness could give birth to a tiger. Or we might, what is more satisfactory, test the objection by the data to hand. For example, of the ten million Negroes in the United States, many are said to be lawyers as well as surgeons and physicians, several thousand have graduated in Universities,* hundreds of thousands ply trades or have acquired property, and a few, such as Dr. Booker Washington and Prof. DuBois, are recognised as men of distinction.† Nor is even this a fair statement of the case. The Negro population of the United States is despised, if not downtrodden, largely deprived of elementary education,

* See Prof. W. G. B. DuBois's searching volume, *The Colored Negro*.

† M. Firmin, a Haitian, a full-blooded Negro, I am informed, has written a highly learned and remarkably judicious and elegant work on the Equality of the Human Races. Another Haitian, of humble and pure descent, but who later became President of the Republic of Haiti, General Legitime, has composed a luminous and comprehensive introduction to philosophy. A West Indian of immaculate Negro descent, Dr. Th. Scholes, has issued two excellent treatises on the races question. The Hon. John Mensa Sarbah, a West African, has written with conspicuous ability on the Fanti National Constitution. Many other works of equal worth, composed by negroes, exist.

and lacking, therefore, generally wealth and the corresponding opportunities for culture. Manifestly, if we assumed that the Negro race ceased to be thus severely handicapped, the possible number of university graduates among them would materially increase.* There remains alone the academic argument that under equal conditions the white race might show a greater proportion of professors or graduates, but the figures are wanting to decide this. Suffice it that we cannot speak of exceptions where thousands of graduates are involved.

A final objection might be raised relating to the absence of great men among the Negroes of the United States. They have produced no Shakespeare, no Beethoven, no Plato. Which is perfectly true; but neither have the teeming millions of the white race of America produced one such towering giant through the centuries. Moreover, the time of the recognition of great men appears to be from about the age of fifty onwards, and altogether only a little over forty years have passed since slavery was abolished in the United States.

Needless to say, what is stated in the preceding paragraphs regarding the capacities of the Negro race—which, according to Sir Harry Johnston, embraces some 150,000,000 souls—holds with increased force of the great Oriental peoples, who can point to complex civilisations and to illustrious sons and daughters.†

We must now examine the contention that man is more than intellect, and that while the various races may be possibly equal on the whole as regards *intelligence*, they differ much in *enterprise, morals and beauty*.

* It might be said that many of the so-called Negro graduates are not full blacks. Since, however, very many of them are, the argument remains unaffected. It should also be noted that "coloured" people are treated precisely as if they were full-blooded.

† "I consider that your propositions could be abundantly supported by instances taken from India," writes a Civil Servant who occupied for many years a responsible post in India.

Enterprise is a vague term to define. So far as the qualities of the warrior are in question, these appear to be universal. The Greeks, the Romans, and the Carthaginians were certainly bold and daring. The Egyptians, the Persians, and the Hebrews fought intrepidly. The Middle Ages found Christians, Turks, and Huns,—accomplished in the fine art of massacre. Gustav Adolf of Sweden, Frederick the Great, Napoleon, Wellington, splendidly led superb armies. Japan recently showed the world what matchless fighting stuff is to be found in the Far East. And so-called savage tribes—north, south, east and west—appear to be no whit behind in the matter of dauntless bravery.

War, however, is supposed to offer a powerful stimulus, and it is argued that where the stimulus is gentle, it finds some races responding and not others. Inveterate idleness is thus stated to distinguish most non-European races. The Hon. James S. Sherman, Vice-President of the United States, well grasps this nettle. "The [American] Indian," he says, "is naturally indolent, naturally slothful, naturally untidy; he works because he has to work, and *primarily he does not differ altogether from the white man in that respect.* Mr. Valentin, this morning, very vividly pictured what the Indians were. He said, as you remember, that some drink, some work and some did not, some saved their money, some provided for their families, and some went to jail. *Still I would like to know what single white community in this whole land of ours that description does not cover?*" (Report of the Twenty-Seventh Annual Meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian and other Dependent Peoples, October 20—22, 1909, pp. 80-81. —Italics are ours.) Vice-President Sherman gives here the happy despatch to a very common fallacy. Man requires an appropriate stimulus to spur him to action, whether it be of the warrior, the hunter, the shepherd, the peasant, the tradesman or the scholar, and West and East are at one in this res-

pect. The inhabitants of China and Japan are world-famed for their industriousness, and the populations of Turkey, Persia, and India are also busy bees in the mass. Similarly the Negro and the American Indian in the United States are falling into the habit of what is called work in the West, and primitive peoples generally are as active as the circumstances demand.

Fearlessness and industry may not form dividing lines between the races ; but what of such attributes as initiative, inventiveness, progress ? Historians inform us that in Dante's time the Western methods of agriculture were still those of the Ancient Romans, and they further show us that the red-haired Teutons about the beginning of our era, while possessing themselves a civilisation of a most rudimentary character, exhibited no desire to emulate the dark-white civilised Romans with whom they came into contact. Should we, then, be justified in concluding from such facts that the European races in general and the Teutonic race in particular are unprogressive races ? Or does this not suggest that complex social conditions determine whether a race shall be pushful, empire-building, inventive, progressive ? So far as modern warfare is concerned, Japan ranges now admittedly with great Western Powers, and in industry and in science this Eastern nation is also taking its place in the front rank. Yesterday, as it were, despotic rule was supposed to hall-mark the East, to-day representative government is clamoured for in the few Oriental countries where it does not exist already. This, too, merely repeats the story of Europe's recent emergence from an autocratic *regime*. Taking further into consideration the imposing ancient civilisations of Egypt and Babylon, Persia and Phœnicia, and more especially the magnificent civilisation of China which is responsible for innumerable inventions and discoveries of the highest order, and bearing in mind that every country in the East is at present re-modelling its civilisation on Western lines, it is

reasonable to suggest that, so far as the spirit of enterprise is concerned, the various races of mankind may be said to be, broadly speaking, on an equality.

We must now examine another momentous factor, *the moral factor*. A few decades ago, due partly to unavoidable ignorance and partly to racial and religious prejudice, it was thought that morality was a monopoly of the West. Bret Harte's Ah-Sin was the typical Chinese; cruelty and prevarication were alleged to be the special prerogative of the Mohammedan, the less developed types of men were head-hunters, cannibals, and shameless; and self-respect and respect for others were iridescent virtues only to be encountered in the Central Europe and the United States. Now, however, that we possess the beautiful Sacred Books of the East in translation, this view has lost almost every vestige of justification, for much in the Chinese, Hindu, Persian, Hebrew, and even Egyptian and Babylonian classics is of the profoundest ethical significance.

Coming to *moral practice*, travellers of unimpeachable repute have taught us that love of family and country, devotion to friends, succour of those in distress, are not virtues characteristic of any one particular race. Concerning the Chinese the distinguished English missionary and scholar, Dr. Legge, says in a Present-Day Tract—

Take the Chinese people as a whole...and there is much about them to like and even to admire. They are cheerful, temperate, industrious, and kindly, and in these respects they will bear a comparison, perhaps a favourable comparison, with the masses of our own population...I found those of them who had any position in society for the most part faithful to their engagements and true to their word. I thought of them better, both morally and socially, when I left them, than when I first went among them, more than 30 years before.*

And such passages abound in modern works, not only in regard to the doyen of the nations but in regard to most non-European peoples.*

* "Among the cleanest—physically and morally—men that

Lastly, that there is little to choose in regard to *physique*, a glance at any good modern collection of fairsized ethnographical photographs will show. It was the old drawings, little more than naive caricatures, and later the photographs of hideous exceptions, which supplied us with those types of other races that suggest startling race distinctions. Michelet and others have dwelt on the beauty of Haitians, and Firmin, with apparent good reason, thinks that the classic type of beauty is closely bound up with a high state of civilisation, a remark which Schneider (*Die Naturvolker*, 1885) endorses. Privation and affluence, refinement and degradation, leave their traces on uncivilised and civilised alike.

We are, then, under the necessity of concluding that *an impartial investigator would be inclined to look upon the various important peoples of the world as, to all intents and purposes, essentially equals in intellect, enterprise, morality, and physique.*

Race prejudice forms a species belonging to a flourishing genus. Prejudices innumerable exist based on callousness, ignorance, misunderstanding, economic rivalry, and, above all, on the fact that our customs are dear to us, but appear ridiculous and perverse to all who do not sympathetically study them. Nation looks down on nation, class on class, religion on religion, sex on sex, and race on race. It is a melancholy spectacle which imaginative insight into the lives and conditions of others should remove.

Considering that the number of race characteristics is legion, it would be embarrassing to assert that they possess a deeper meaning. Every small tribe seems to be the happy possessor of a little army of special characteristics, and one ethnologist actually

I have known have been some African descent" (Prof. B. G. Wilder, *The Brain of the American Negro*, 1909). See also the chapter on the truthfulness of the Hindus in Max Muller's *What can India teach us?*

speaks of five hundred tribes to be found in a radius of as many miles in a certain locality. The American Indians are said to be related to the Tartars, whilst possessing very distinct common traits; and each of the at-present recognised great racial divisions is equally capable of subdivision, and equally merges by degrees into the others. Again, we hear of red-haired, yellow-haired, fair-haired, brown-haired, and black-haired peoples, and we read of frizzly hair, wooly hair, silken hair, as well as of a few tufts of hair on the head in some tribes, and trains of hair trailing on the ground in others. Peoples differ in average height from less than four feet to over six feet. Some of these have very small and others very large eyes, and length of limbs varies considerably. The bodies of some few tribes are richly covered with hair, while others are practically devoid of it. The variations in colour of skin, from pink to yellow, reddish-brown and black-brown, are very conspicuous, and the so-called Caucasian type alone embraces the fair Scandinavian, the dusky Italian, the dark Hindu, and the almost dark Fellah. Noses, lips, chins, cheek-bones, jaws, vary prodigiously, and no less facial angle, forehead, and shape of skull. Accordingly the observable physical differences between so-called distinct races must be regarded as incidental on pain of having to assume hundreds of separate origins for the human race. Ratzel truly says:—

"It may be safely asserted that the study of comparative ethnology in recent years has tended to diminish the weight of the traditionally accepted views of anthropologists as to racial distinctions, and that in any case they afford no support to the view which sees in the so-called lower races of mankind a transition stage from beast to man."*

We commonly judge races nearly as much by their customs as by their physical appearance, almost as if the former fatally depended on the latter. Indeed, anthropologists and travellers often unquestioningly

* A comprehensive criticism of works that lay stress on the inequality of races is to be found in Jean Finot's *Race Prejudice* and in Friedrich Hertz's *Moderne Rassentheorien*.

and unsuspectingly assume that the mental traits of races are innate and fixed, like the tendency to anger or to walking uprightly. Yet a Zulu, for instance, taken from his tribe where he appears to possess innumerable rooted and peculiar customs, very soon loses them nearly all. The American Negro Missionaries in Africa find that custom is deeper than physical appearance, since their fellow Negroes in Africa look upon them as Americans rather than as men of their own kith and kin. As one of the Honorary Vice-Presidents of the First Universal Races Congress, the first delegate to the second Hague Conference of one of the greatest Eastern Empires, convincingly expresses this in a letter to the Congress Executive:—

“Races show nothing but skin-deep differences of language, of religion, of manners and customs, which are nothing but accidental modalities attendant on their respective historical evolutions in the past—in no way sufficiently powerful to efface the sub-stratum common to all humanity, and in no way tending to hinder any co-operative effort in the fulfilment of the mission common to mankind in general.”

Is it, then, to be inferred, we may be asked in astonishment, that we should encourage indiscriminate miscegenation, free intermarriage between white, black, and yellow races? The inference need not be drawn, since we may say that, just as in parts of Europe, for instance, Protestants, Catholics, and Jews live together amicably while yet intermarrying very rarely, so the equality of the human races might be universally acknowledged and yet intermarriage not take place. However, we ought to note that in the West the fairest whites freely intermarry with the darkest whites, and that is difficult to see why—theoretically at least—any limit should be drawn.

What has been said above regarding the ephemeral importance of racial distinctions embraces, so it appears to the present writer, the bedrock truth which must be ever borne in mind in this controversy. The trunk of the elephant, the neck of the giraffe, are something singular in the animal king-

dom. Man, too, possesses a unique quality which likewise sharply divides him from sentient beings generally. All other animals are almost altogether guided by individual or gregarious instincts and their wisdom, natural and acquired, almost completely dies with them. The bee's hive and the ant's nest represent wonderful structures, but these structures, wherever we meet them, are so strikingly alike that it is evident natural selection and not reason or tradition accounts for them. Only man as a race has a history, a history of speech and writing, a history of architecture and dress, a history of laws, and one of arts and crafts. The individual thought of thousands of brains has, to give a trivial instance, created the safety bicycles, and the collective thought of millions through the ages has built up our complex civilisation. And this thought is transmitted *socially*—through home and school education, through public institutions, or through the imposing accumulations, of science, art, and industry. Except for such social transmission the work of the past would have to be commenced, Sisyphus-like, all over again by each generation, and the stage of savagery and barbarism would be unending.

Man's social nature distinguishes him from his fellow animals *absolutely* in that no animal species, however gregarious, is in possession of traditional knowledge, collected throughout the length and breadth of thousands of years, and fundamentally in that any attempt to turn an animal into a social being is doomed to fail miserably. To illustrate, the domesticated animals may readily be isolated at birth from their kind with no appreciable consequences to their development, while, on the other hand, a human being thus placed would probably grow up more brutish than a brute. Man's upright attitude, his comparative hairlessness, the place of his thumbs, the size and weight of his brain, are undoubtedly radical differentia in relation to other animals; but these in itself do not constitute him the premier species of the globe. The most hopelessly benighted

pigmy in the forests of Central Africa possesses these characteristics nearly in perfection. The social and historical element makes man the civilized being, and it alone accounts for the successive ages of stone, bronze, iron, steam, and electricity.

A theory such as is here propounded ought to remove innumerable preconceptions from thinking minds. It is a theory which in a very real sense makes all men kin. It discourages inconsiderate pride of race, of sex, of birth, of nation, of class, and of religion. It encourages education, co-operation, science, strenuousness combined with modesty, and equal rights and opportunities for all men and women. It puts at its true value the eminently plausible but almost certainly unscientific doctrine that mankind can solely or mainly be improved in the only manner that animals can—i.e., by careful selection or breeding. Above all, it paves the way for national and international concord and co-operation, and for a fair treatment of backward races, subject peoples, and small nations.

In conclusion, the writer of this paper cannot refrain from expressing a fervent hope that the deliberations of the First Universal Congress may result in a better understanding and a higher appreciation of the different peoples on the globe, and may lead to the enactment of beneficent laws as well as to the formation of a powerful public opinion which shall promote this loftiest of objects.

Conclusions.—The present writer has taken the liberty to put forward as his conclusions certain proposals implicit in the Questionnaire published by the Congress Executive. He has preserved the wording as far as possible :—

1. (a) It is not legitimate to argue from differences in physical characteristics to differences in mental characteristics. (b) The physical and mental characteristics observable in a particular race are not (1) permanent, (2) modifiable only through ages of environmental pressure; but (3) marked changes in popular education, in public sentiment, and in environment generally, may, apart from intermarriage, materially transform physical and especially mental characteristics in a generation or two.

2. (a) The status of a race at any particular moment of time offers no index to its innate or inherited capacities. (b) It is of great importance in this respect to recognize that civilizations are meteoric in nature, bursting out of obscurity only to plunge back into it.

3. (a) We ought to combat the irreconcilable contentions prevalent among all the more important races of mankind that *their* customs, *their* civilizations, and *their* race are superior to those of other races. (b) In explanation of existing differences we would refer to special needs arising from peculiar geographical and economic conditions and to related divergences in national history; and, in explanation of the attitude assumed, we would refer to intimacy with one's own customs leading psychologically to a love of them and unfamiliarity with others' customs tending to lead psychologically to dislike and contempt of these latter.

4. (a) Differences in economic, hygienic, moral, and educational standards play a vital part in estranging races which come in contact with each other. (b) These differences, like social differences generally, are in substance almost certainly due to passing social conditions and not to innate racial characteristics, and the aim should be, as in social differences, to remove these rather than to accentuate them by regarding them as fixed.

5. (a) The deepest cause of race misunderstandings is perhaps the tacit assumption that the present characteristics of a race are the expression of fixed and permanent racial characteristics. (b) If so, anthropologists, sociologists, and scientific thinkers as a class, could powerfully assist the movement for a juster appreciation of races by persistently pointing out in their lectures and in their works the fundamental fallacy involved in taking a static instead of a dynamic, a momentary instead of a historic, a local instead of a general, point of view of race characteristics. (c) And such dynamic teaching could be conveniently introduced into schools, more especially in the geography and history lessons; also into colleges for the training of teachers, diplomats, colonial administrators, and missionaries.

6. (a) The belief in racial superiority is largely due, as is suggested above, to unenlightened psychological repulsion and under-estimation of the dynamic or environmental factors; (b) there is no fair proof of some races being substantially superior to others in inborn capacity, and hence our moral standard need never be modified.

7. (A) (a) So far at least as intellectual and moral aptitudes are concerned, we ought to speak of civilizations where we now speak of races; (b) the stage or form of the civilization of a people has no connection with its special inborn physical characteristics; (c) and even its physical characteristics are to no small extent the direct result of the environment, physical and social, under which it is living at the moment. (B) To aid in clearing

up the conceptions of *race* and *civilization*, it would be of great value to define these.

8. (a) Each race might with advantage study the customs and civilizations of other races, even those it thinks the lowliest ones, for the definite purpose of improving its own customs and civilization. (b) Unostentatious contact generally and respect for the customs of other races, provided these are not morally objectionable, should be recommended to all who come in passing or permanent contact with members of other races.

9. (a) It would be well to collect accounts of any experiments on a considerable scale, past or present, showing the successful uplifting of relatively backward races by the application of purely humane methods; (b) also any cases of colonisation or opening of a country achieved by the same methods; (c) and such methods might be applied universally in our dealings with other races.

10. The Congress might effectively (a) carry out its object of encouraging better relations between East and West by encouraging or carrying out, among others, the above proposals, and more particularly (b) by encouraging the formation of an association designed to promote inter-racial amity.

THE ALLEGED INFERIORITY OF THE COLOURED RACES—I.

There are three modes of accounting for the origin of the human race, adopted by three different schools of ethnology. Polygenesis considers each race as a distinct species, created in the place of its original home. Evolution represents the races as belonging to a common species, but as having sprung from separate stocks or centres of that species. Monogenesis derives the races not from a common species only, but from a single human pair. The theory of monogenesis is naturally distasteful to those white people in whom the prejudice against the coloured races is strong. Besides being the simplest, it seems, however to be the most probable theory regarding the origin of mankind, and no valid objection has yet been urged against it. The Evolutionist derives the complex human organism, with all the differen-

ces of form and colour, from a single pair of cells; so on the ground of analogy, it should be admitted that the various races have developed from a single pair of human beings. It has been objected that the monogenist school have not succeeded in explaining how the sons of one father dwelling in close proximity, and whose descendants would be constantly intermarrying, came to have such distinct progenies. But at an early stage of multiplication the progeny of the common ancestor must have separated, and isolation, precipitated by linguistic diversity and encouraged by distance, would have checked the mixture of the groups and helped the preservation of race-traits. In support, however, of the separate origin of races, ethnologists of the first two schools adduce certain proofs, based upon physical peculiarities. They assert that between the fair and the dark races there are *radical* physical distinctions which indicate in the case of the dark races, mental and moral inferiority, and they also allege a tendency to sterility in the case of procreation between the dark and fair races. The reader of the following lines, if free from preconceived bias in favour of the white-skinned races, will have no difficulty in discovering the more or less mythical character of these proofs and allegations.

I shall begin by quoting a passage from Dr. Scholes' *Glimpses of the Ages*, a book on which I have mainly drawn, in which he first states a fact well-known to us, and then gives the reasoning by which it is sought to be justified by the colourless races. Dr. Scholes says:—

"After the colourless race had imposed its rule upon the coloured races, it sought by means of its languages, its literatures, religion, philosophy, science, and its laws to consolidate the power which it had established by force. But strange as the fact may appear, when the seeds of law, religion, literature, etc., so industriously sown by the fair race, began to yield the fruits of uniformity, proximity, concord between it and its clients—the fair race, filled with alarm, strives to destroy the harvest. Here, then, is found, not the enemy sowing with tares the field of the slumbering husbandman, but the husbandman, himself awake, and professing great wisdom, sowing with tares his own field.

Nor is the psychological condition which has driven this mother—if I may change the metaphor—to attempt the life of her own offspring due to the sudden seizure of puerperal insanity, but rather to the mature conviction of serene deliberation. Thus the fair race alleges that its feeling of antipathy towards the dark races, and its endeavour to prevent them rising beyond a low stage, are justifiable on historic and scientific grounds. Science, it avers, by demonstrating the presence of certain peculiarities—physical, mental and moral—as being common to all the coloured races, peculiarities accounting for the secondary rank, which, instead of a primary rank, they uniformly take in the march of the world's progress, not only proves the impracticability of those coloured races co-operating with the fair race, on terms of political and social equality, but proves also that such a co-operation, by exposing the fair race to deterioration, and thereby menacing the causes of order and of progress, would be destructive no less to the coloured races themselves than to the fair race."

The most prominent physical peculiarity to which 'science' points, lies of course, in the crime of colour. It is therefore necessary to examine the colour theory in some detail. Mankind is usually divided into three varieties according to the colour of the skin—the melanous, the leucous and the xanthous. The melanous comprises people with dark or black skins, black hair, and black eyes. The xanthous pertains to people with yellow or yellowish hair, bluish or grey eyes, and fair complexion. The leucous, relates to people who are obnormally white, such as the albinos. The albinos, as is well-known, are found in every race and clime. The xanthous complexion too appears in people of the melanous variety. Occasionally among Indians one meets with persons who would pass as fair in comparison with an Italian or Spaniard. The melanous variety of colour is also to be found in every xanthous race, as for instance, in the skin of the brunette of western Europe. Colour is the product of a substance called melanin, or black pigment; its chief seats are the skin, the hair of the head and the eye. Among all races, the three varieties of colour usually predominates.* Moreover, in the

* The fair complexion of the shell-cutting Shankaris of Dacca, referred to by Sir H. Risely, was noticed as early as 1839 by Dr.

red or brown hair and the blue or grey eyes of the white races, if not in their skin, melanin is present. Thus the presence of the black pigment in their organism cannot be regarded as a peculiarity of the dark races nor can it be advanced as an argument in support of their alleged inferiority to the European races and against the theory that all the races, whatever their colour, have sprung from one stock of one and the same species.

It is a favourite doctrine with a certain class of ethnologists that the deposition of melanin in the skin is post-natal, due to climate influences operating through many generations. The mental endowment of a race is thus associated, not only with its colour, but also with its habitat. The historian Buckle is responsible for the popularity of this theory. The following considerations will, I trust, suffice to demonstrate the utter futility of this doctrine. (1) Melanin is only one of a group of colouring matters derived from the blood and there are at least six other such substances, which are deposited before birth. Being of the same nature as all the other members of this group of pigment, and like them, being derived from the blood, the logical conclusion would be that it too has been deposited before birth. (2) It is known that melanin is deposited in the eye and the hair of the head before birth; we should therefore conclude that the same is the case with its deposition in the skin. (8) If these cutaneous variations in different races be due to climate, then to what are the variations in the colour of the hair of the head and eyes, among peoples in Europe who have lived for ages in the same localities, due? (4) If colour be due to climate, how again do you account for the class of animals, for example, the bear, which has brown or black skin, but whose habitat is the Polar Circle? (5) The bronzing of the

Taylor who in his *Topography of Dacca* (Chapter VIII) speaks of them as follows:

"Most of them are of a fairer complexion than natives in general, and in some of their families there are a few Albinos."

white artisan through exposure to the sun or of the white tourist in hot countries, which have been referred to as illustrations of the influence of climate on colour, does not affect the argument, for the bronzed complexion is not maintained after the employment is abandoned by the artisan or the tourist returns to his home, and in any case this acquired colour is never transmitted from generation to generation. (6) Finally, pigment granules have been found by actual investigation in the skin of Negro foetuses.

It is no doubt true that pigment tempers the solar heat, and that is the probable function of colour. The monogenists hold that each race, people, or tribe, according to its cutaneous equipment, chose the climate that best harmonised with its dermal idiosyncrasy, and in this way explain the migration of the races. Circumstances of a political or economic nature may have forced a coloured people like the Esquimaux now and then to migrate beyond the subtropical zones to which they were adapted by nature.

The second physical peculiarity on which ethnologists love to dwell is cranial variation. The study of skull-measurement has been raised to the dignity of a science, and is called craniology; the whole series of race-distinctions, based on the shape of the cranium, the colour of the skin, the projection of the face, and stature, being given the name of anthropometry. The division of races into Caucasian, Mongolian, etc., had the disadvantage of placing the Hindu, the Persian, and the Egyptian in the same category with the Teuton or the Latin races. Herein lay the value of craniology. For, in its name, one of the high priests of that 'science', Dr. Nott, is able to tell the world :—

"What reason is there to suppose that...the Hindu [has descended] from the same stock as the Teuton? The Hindu is almost as far removed in structure from the Teuton as is the Hottentot, and we might just as well classify the reindeer and gazelles together as the Teuton and Hindu....."

As a result of his anthropometric survey, Sir Herbert Risley * has divided the people of India into eight distinctive types. His investigations have led him to hold that the Dravidians were the aboriginal people of India, that the Indo-Aryan type, of which dolichocephally (long-head) is one of the chief characteristics, is confined to Rajputana, Kashmir and the Punjab, that the Mahratta Brahmins are Scytho-Dravidians, and the Bengal Brahmins Mongolo-Dravidians with probably 'a strain of Indo-Aryan blood.' Elsewhere, Sir Herbert alludes to the Adisur tradition which is said to be borne out to a substantial degree by the measurements of the Brahmin and Kayestha head-forms of Bengal, inasmuch as among them, 'notwithstanding the uncompromising breadth of the head,' the finer nose-forms predominate. Sir Herbert is, however, modest enough to admit that the conclusions which he had 'ventured to put forward are necessarily provisional, and will be of use mainly as a guide to research...'

One cannot help sympathising with the poor craniologist in the difficulties which beset his path. No sooner did Dr. Nott conclude from his investigations that the negroes had shorter heads than the Europeans, than he burst forth into the following triumphant pæan:—

"It is mind, and mind alone, which constitutes the proudest prerogative of man, whose excellence should be measured by his intelligence and virtue. The negro and other unintellectual types have been shown...to possess heads much smaller, by actual measurement in cubic inches, than the white races; and although a metaphysician may dispute about the causes which may have debased their intellects or precluded their expansion, it cannot be denied that the dark races are, in this particular, greatly inferior to the others of fairer complexion."

Sir Herbert's difficulty lay elsewhere. He could not deny the mental superiority of the Hindu Bengalis, whom he for that very reason, helped in reducing to a minority in each of the divided halves of Bengal. So he alludes to their intellectual eminence

* See Census of India, 1901, Vol. I., Chapter XI.

with as little grace as possible, speaks of 'their remarkable aptitude for clerical pursuits,' and proceeds to derive what consolation he may by denying the intellectual Bengali and the pugnacious Marhatta racial affinity with the Imperial Briton through descent from a common Aryan stock.

Let us now examine the value of the science of craniology, as estimated by ethnologists who are themselves polygenists or evolutionists. Prof. Brinton says :—

"Ethnologists who are merely anatomists have made too much of this science.....and have given it a prominence it does not deserve.....Within the limits of the same people...the most different skulls are found and even the pure-blooded natives of some small islands in the Pacific Ocean present widely various forms."

Professor Keane, continuing his remarks with reference to the scientific value of cranial measurements, says :—

"The result has shown that craniology alone cannot be depended upon to supply sufficient, or even altogether trustworthy materials for distinguishing the main divisions of mankind. Its chief elements, such as dolichocephaly, brachicephaly, orthognathism, and prognathism * are not constant in any given group, and in many cases the most surprising diversity prevails, where some degree of uniformity might be expected."

According to Dr. Vogt, the measurements of Retzius and Broca revealed the dolichocephalic and the other two types of head in every race. Sir Herbert Risley, who must be counted among the *pundits* of anthropometry, has to admit that 'long, broad and medium heads are met with in varying degrees of preponderance among white, black and yellow races.' And yet, with curious inconsistency, he asserts, almost immediately after, that 'all authorities agree in regarding the form of the head as an extremely constant and persistent character, which resists the influence of climate and physical

* I should explain the meaning of these pompous words coined by the Swedish naturalist Anders Retzius in 1842, for the benefit of the uninitiated. The first two refer to the size of the head, and mean 'long-head' 'short-head', the last two refer to the projection of the face, and mean 'conforming to the human standard', 'conforming to the standard of the brute'.

surroundings.' Further on, warming to his subject, Sir Herbert grows more positive: 'On the whole, therefore, the form of the head, specially when combined with other characters, is a good test of racial affinity.' But in the next sentence he makes the following important reservation which practically amounts to giving his case away. 'It may be added that neither the shape nor the size of the head seems to bear any direct relation to intellectual capacity. People with long [dolichocephalic] heads cannot be said to be cleverer or more advanced in culture than people with short [brachycephalic] heads.'

Were the measurements, upon which the conclusions of the anthropometrists are based, taken from a mass of skulls gathered from a wide area? Let us see. 'It must be admitted,' says Vogt, 'that Retzius' measurements were confined to a few skulls which he selected as typical, and that he estimated the cranial shape rather from the general impression of the aspect of the skulls than by exact measurements.' Dr. Marton, another craniologist, based his observations on the Teutonic group of races on the measurement of thirty Teutonic skulls. Topinard determined the nasal index of the Gallic race by measuring the noses of sixty-eight Parisians. Professor Aeby of Berne had less than six hundred skulls for the classification of all mankind. Sir Herbert Risley took the measurements of 'nearly six thousand persons representing eighty-nine of the leading castes and tribes in Northern India, from the Bay of Bengal to the frontiers of Afghanistan;'"* that is to say, he based his generalisations regarding the races of India on the examination of less than seventy heads for each tribal or caste group. Dr. Vogt based his observations on the head form of the Ethiopian on the examination of six skulls only! And quite in keeping with the above, he laid down the proposition that the brain of a Negro had a less number of convolutions than a white man's brain, thus indicating racial inferiority, from the observation of *the cast of*

* Tribes and Castes of Bengal (1819), by H. H. Risley, Introd,

a Hottentot woman's brain. Dr. Scholes most truly observes :—

"The brain of a solitary Hottentot female, and not even the brain, but only the model of that brain, is made to supply the facts for a generalisation concerning the brain-structure and the brain-capacity of some 212 millions of the human race. Is a greater travesty of scientific research possible? And yet, of this particular department, the sample now furnished represents the quality of the facts habitually served up to the world by the wholesale and retail traffickers in the popular wares of Negro aspersion."

It is well to mention here that craniologists are not even agreed as to the broad results of their investigations. For among them, there are persons—such as Drs. Deniker and Tiedmann—according to whom both in size as well as in internal capacity, the skull of the Caucasian is not one whit larger than that of the coloured races.

Thus we find that the cranium is no guide to the origin of races; that the crania examined are too few to establish any theory concerning the predominance of a certain cranial type in each race; that the three different types of crania are all three found in each race; and that hence, on the ground of cranial peculiarity no justification exists for applying to one race the term 'superior' and to another race the term 'inferior'; and that as far as cranial variation is concerned there is nothing against the probability of there being to the Caucasian, Mongolian and Negro races a common origin.

And yet, to what uses has this *psuedo-science* of craniology been put, will appear from the following extracts from two well-known newspapers, the *Referee* and the *Spectator*. One of the articles was based on the incident of the invitation of Booker Washington to dinner at the White House and the other was written in 1907 when the ethnological survey of India was about to be undertaken.

The Referee :—

"[The Negro] will have to redress the facial angle, and he will have to grow a more spacious cranium before he can come into brotherhood with the more advanced nations of mankind."

The Spectator writes :—

"In education in particular, and even in administration, we underrate the extreme variety of origin among the peoples of India.....and are apt to proceed as if they were all Aryans, that is, persons with receptive brains, instead of recognising that divisions of them, perhaps a fourth of the population, are Australoids or aboriginal Mongols, whose brains need preparation before they can understand, much less assimilate, Western ideas.

Here is Dr. Scholes' vigorous criticism of the above :—

"No doubt, by those unacquainted with the ingredients—in the form of facts—of which these extracts are made up, they will have been imbibed, as other nostrams of the same class are being imbibed, as vintages of the choicest brand ; thereby giving point to the maxim that "where ignorance is bliss it is folly to be wise."—"Redressing the facial angle," "growing a morespacious cranium," "longheads," "shortheads." How imposing they look! How erudite they sound! But of the inhabitants of Central and Northern Europe, what was the character of their "facial angle" at the time of the Roman Conquest? And when was it redressed? In those days were there only "shortheads"? If there were not, what has become of the "longheads"? Such, then, is the manner wherein these fallacies of ethnology, introduced thirty or forty year ago, are to-day being masqueraded in our current literature."

And now the reader will be prepared for the following passage, taken from the introduction to Dr. Scholes' book :—

"Christendom at the present time suffers from a plethora of lies.....truth is spoken only within the limitations prescribed by politics. Politics is the *summum genus* of the *species* civilised institutions—municipal administration, social life, education, law, commerce, religion, literature, science, philanthropy—all in practice, of course not in theory, and in, and are regulated by, political considerations. And as the 'interests' of politics frequently demand the total suppression, or the partial statement only of truth, these institutions are found accordingly harmonising truth with the exigencies of politics. Let me furnish a single example. Nearly fifty years ago certain ethnologists and anthropologists, upon the most ludicrously inadequate data, taught that, among the coloured races, there were certain anatomical peculiarities present, which not only distinguished these races from the white race, but made them physically, morally and mentally the inferiors of the white race. For many years after its announcement this theory, in almost every quarter, found little or no credence. But when some thirty years ago the Euro-

American, desiring to retain in his own hands all political power, resolved to oust the Afro-American from politics, and later, when Englishmen followed more or less by others of the European colonising States, for the same reason as that which promoted the Euro-American, resolved, in like manner, to effectively bar the progress of their coloured fellow-subjects towards political enfranchisement, this theory was exhumed from the grave of its oblivion, was galvanised into life, and by religion, commerce, literature, and all the other institutions of civilisation, has since then been employed to hold in serfdom the larger section of mankind. It must be observed, that during the nearly fifty years that have intervened since these hypothetical, anatomical peculiarities were published, a great accumulation of facts—the result of increased anatomical knowledge, of better acquaintance with the environments and habits of primitive peoples, and most of all, the result of the progress of numerous coloured communities under western culture—has been available.

"These facts.....are overwhelming in their disproof of the reported anatomical peculiarities of the coloured races. Yet how have such facts been received? They have been modified, ignored, or repressed, in order that the discredited assertions made forty or fifty years ago may be brought into harmony with the dictates of politics, and that in consequence, the coloured races may, with some show of reason, be held in the semi-bondage of pupillage.....And with respect to science, whereas in other departments, including religion, science demands for its researches, independence, and for its findings, free speech, here where the "interests" of politics are involved, worse even than being muzzled, science prevaricates.

How deserved the above scathing observations are, will further appear from the fact that not only the head and the face, but even other parts of the Negro's organism have been found fault with. Vogt asserts that his belly is relaxed and pendulous, he rarely stands upright, his knees are usually bent and the legs frequently bandy and so on. The vocabulary of abuse was hardly sufficient to meet the requirements of this scientist's description of the negro anatomy.* Dr. Scholes with the experience gained from his prolonged residence in Africa, answers him thus:—

"With the solitary exception of Dr. Vogt, all the world knows

* Readers of 'In India' by the Late Mr. Stevens, the brilliant correspondent of the *London Daily Mail*, will recall certain similar utterances regarding the Bengalis, for which there was about equal justification, as he stood observing them pass before him on the Hughly Bridge at Calcutta.

that but for his magnificent physique, equalled by few, if any, but surpassed by none, the Ethiopian could never have successfully encountered, and profitably survived, the rigour and ravages of a remorseless and relentless servitude."

But among ethnologists themselves there are persons who are capable of taking a saner view, and two of them are quoted below.

Dr. Prichard says:—

"From a consideration of the facts which belong to this department of inquiry, and a comparison of different tribes with each other, an inference appeared to result that all diversities of anatomical structures that are known to characterise the different tribes of men are mere varieties, and do not amount to specific differences."

Blumenbach makes the following emphatic observation:—

"'God's image he too,' as Fuller says, 'although made out of ebony.' This has been doubted sometimes, and on the contrary it has been asserted that the negroes are specifically different in their bodily structure from other men, and must be placed considerably in the rear, from the condition of their obtuse mental capacities. Personal observation, combined with the accounts of trustworthy and unprejudiced witnesses, has, however, long since convinced me of the want of foundation in both these assertions.....I am acquainted with no single distinctive bodily character which is at once peculiar to the negro and which cannot be found to exist in many other and distant nations; none which is in the like way common to the negroes, and in which they do not again come in contact with other nations through imperceptible passages, just as every other variety of man runs into the neighbouring populations."

Another argument which remains to be examined is that mulattoes, who are the offspring of the African and the Teuton, intermarrying among themselves, tend to become sterile. Dr. Nott, the author of this proposition, however, admits that the offspring of the Latin and the African races are quite prolific.

Between the mulattoes of the slave states of the American Union and the blacks, constant intermarriages take place and hence the census statistics of the United States afford no data for studying the prolificacy of the mulattoes *among themselves*. But the social position of the mulatto in the West Indies

is one of comparative isolation from both white and black. Comparing the increase of population in Jamaica with that of England and Wales between the years 1834-1881, we find that whereas in England and Wales there has been an increase of 49 p.c., among the mulatto population of Jamaica, for the same period, the increase was 63 p.c. That is to say, during forty-seven years the prolificacy of mulattoes of Anglo-African descent in Jamaica among themselves was 14 p.c. more than that of the population of England and Wales during the same period. And thus the attempt by means of the assumed infertility among the offspring of Anglo-African parentage, to prove the difference of origin of the races, has also failed.

The last proposition which has been advanced against the theory of monogenesis may be illustrated by another newspaper quotation. The following is an extract from a leading article in the *London Daily News* of July 4th, 1902, on the centenary of Dumas:—

"To-day is the centenary of the birth of the most striking and graphic writer of prose fiction which the whole range of literature present—Alexander Dumas pere, who, July 4th, 1802, began a stormful life of brilliant genius and ungovernable propensities. His father was a Creole. And the son exhibited some but not all of the characteristics which usually result from the blending of the blood of the white man with that of the Negro. Often, if not generally, that result is a union of the worst qualities of both races, or descendants in whom the quicker intelligence of the white race seems only to animate and excite the lower propensities of the Negro..... The offspring of such unions often prove what are called 'sports,' and there is a chance of such being a genius, as Dumas undoubtedly was..... He lived his life furiously and recklessly, squandering his amazing gifts on husks of literature and the world. He was without principle and without self-respect."

I shall conclude the present paper with Dr. Scholes' criticism of this specious theory:

"Thus, seeing that Oliver Goldsmith, Robert Burns, and Lord Byron, like Dumas, were geniuses, and also, like him, suffered from laxity of morals, we must conclude that they too had Negro blood in their veins, which was accountable for their moral obliquity.

"But if these three men had not Negro blood in their veins and yet were geniuses and at the same time transgressors in morals,

then there is no ground for attributing Dumas' moral transgression to his mixed parentage. Again, if these three men had no mixed blood and yet were moral delinquents, then the *Daily News*, in attributing Dumas' irregularities to his African blood, is guilty of the logical fallacy of irrelevant conclusion. Such, then, is another of the proofs by which the statement, that the children of mixed unions inherit the bad qualities of both races, is supported.

"Besides, the propagators of this theory lay themselves under the obligation of accounting for the bad qualities of the criminal classes of Europe and America: for the criminal classes of the latter place, who are not mulattoes."

THE ALLEGED INFERIORITY OF THE COLOURED RACES—II.

In our first paper on this subject, we have tried to show, principally on the authority of Dr. Scholes, the entirely fallacious character of the reasonings, based on physical differences, by which the superiority of the colourless races over the coloured is sought to be proved. It will be our purpose in the present paper, relying mainly* on the same source, to attempt to show that just as science does not support the theory of physical superiority, so history refutes the theory of mental superiority of the colourless over the coloured races.

It was actually believed by some pious slave-owners in the Southern States of the American Union,

* Mainly, but not, entirely. Other authorities consulted are—Ameer Ali's *History of the Saracens*. Draper's *History of the Intellectual Development of Europe and Conflict of Religion and Science*; Lecky's *History of European Morals*; Buckle's *History of Civilisation*, edited by J. W. Robertson; Bluntschli's *Theory of State*; Wilkinson's *History of the Ancient Egyptians*; Brennan's *Hindu Astronomy* (London 1896), a valuable book, now become rare.

that colour has no function except as a mark of inferiority, and especially as the sign of a curse upon the Ethiopian race, of which slavery is a corollary. Dr. Scholes meets the racial fanaticism by an argument which ought to appeal to Christians—

"If the black skin of the Ethiopian were the expression of the servitude to which the Deity in a curse had condemned him, then what curse was there that consigned to the rigours of Egyptian bondage, for four hundred years, the Hebrews—the chosen people of God? And if a divine curse, were the Hebrews the chosen people of God? And if a divine curse, were the Hebrews black?"

"Further, if in addition to the black skin, the mental and moral degradation of the Ethiopian be also symptoms of this curse, then of what curse were the moral and mental degradation of the European, in former ages, the symptoms? The Greeks had their slaves, who probably were all whites; the Romans had their slaves, who were more white than black....."

Not only is the capacity for intellectual progress denied to the coloured races, but it is also asserted that they are incapable of moral progress, for, on the authority of no less a scientist than Darwin, high moral attainment is the equivalent of high intellectual development. But Dr. Scholes shows by quotations from Mommsen and others that the century preceding the Christian Era, though one of very high intellectual attainment in Rome, was at the same time a period characterised by an insane display of wealth and a mad extravagance, an unrestrained sexual license, and slavery on an extensive scale. The intellectual progress made by western Europe in the eighteenth century does not therefore connote a corresponding moral progress.

In order that the assertions of the mental superiority of the colourless races may be sustained, it must be shown (1) either that the colourless race has always been progressive, or that, when unprogressive, its position mentally was higher than that in which the mental condition of the coloured races has invariably stood; (2) that the coloured races have been uniformly unprogressive, that the depth of their unprogressiveness has been always greater than that which the colourless race has ever reached, and that when brought in contact

with a progressive race they had never evinced any capacity to rise from their habitually low plane of existence.

The progress made by the Afro-Americans, the modern Egyptians and Indians, and the phenomenal success of Japan in assimilating all that is considered best in European civilisation are sufficient examples of the fact that the coloured races, when they come in contact with the civilised white races, can raise themselves in the scale of civilisation.

Dr. Scholes, in his *Glimpses of the Ages*, has abundantly proved, by lengthy extracts from ancient historians like Tacitus, Polybius, Plutarch and Cæsar, that the Germans, Gauls, Celts and Britons, the predecessors of the highly civilised races of modern Europe and America, were in a state of existence which was "in certain of its phases lower than that in which the most barbarous of modern savages are now found." Cæsar describes the native Briton as follows:—

"The inhabitants of Kent, which lies wholly on the sea-coast, are the most civilised of all the Britons, and differ but little in their manners from the Gauls. The greater part of those within the country never sow their lands, but live on flesh and milk, and go clad in skins. All the Britons in general paint themselves with woad, which gives a bluish cast to the skin and makes them look dreadful in battle. They are long-haired, and shave the rest of the body except the head and upper lip. Ten or twelve of them live together, having their wives in common, especially brothers or parents, and children among themselves, but the issue is always ascribed to him who first espoused the mother."

The Roman historians expatiate on the ignorance, treachery, superstition, unreliableness, unprogressiveness, and general low form of life of these early barbarians: and dwell upon the absence among them of all knowledge of the metals and of any art, and of permanent habitations; they speak of the extreme poverty and wretchedness prevailing among these people, of the practice of incest, polygamy, human sacrifice and domestic slavery, and of the indolence and ferocity of these predecessors of the modern Englishman, Franchman and German. The degrada-

tion of womanhood had gone so far that the tillage of the soil was imposed on women. A Chinese poet of that age would have been entirely justified in singing—

Better fifty years of Cathay
Than a cycle of Europe.

During the present war the most heinous crimes, the most fiendish cruelty and the most degraded kind of bestiality have been attributed to the Germans. These, if true, would prove the colourless Teuton to be worse than any coloured savage ; if false, they would prove the accusers of the Germans, also colourless, to be unsurpassed liars.

We will now pass briefly in review some of the ancient civilisations of the world which were of a non-European origin. To take the earliest* of them first. We all know about the ancient Egyptians, who possessed a civilisation of a very high order eighteen centuries before Christ. Their pyramids are inimitable ; so also their stupendous bronze statues ; they possessed the secrets of hardening or tempering bronze with which modern Europe is unacquainted ; the secret of embalming dead bodies is a lost art. Their musical instruments, their jewellery, their gold and silver vases, their chairs, ottomans and fauteuils, and their manufactures of cotton, linen and paper, formed the models for the imitation of the most advanced nations of later times. They attained a mastery in the manufacture of glass which has not been successfully imitated by the modern nations. The sculptures of Thebes and Beni Hassan, the architecture of the temples and the tombs, are a marvel to this day. In the mathematical and the physical sciences, such as Geometry, Astronomy, Chemistry, Mechanics, they were the teachers of Greece. Their laws and priestly regulations were framed with great wisdom. Lest the reader thinks that the above remarks are exaggerated, I shall quote a few sentences from Wilkinson's standard work :—

* In the opinion of European savants.

"Nor were they deficient in taste,—a taste, too, not acquired by imitating approved models, but claiming for itself the praise of originality, and universally allowed to have been the portent of much that was afterwards perfected, with such wonderful success, by the most highly gifted of nations, the Greeks." "..... the wonderful mechanical skill of the Egyptians; and we may question whether with the ingenuity and science of the present day our engineers are capable of raising weights with the same facility as that ancient people." "How far then do we find the Egyptians surpassing the Greeks, at this early period, in the science of music! Indeed, long before the lyre was known in Greece, the Egyptians had attained the highest degree of perfection in the form of their stringed instruments; on which no improvement was found necessary, even at a time when their skill was so great that Greek sages visited Egypt to study music, among the other sciences, for which it was renowned." "Many of their ornamental vases as well as those in common use present the most elegant forms, which would do honour to the skill of a Greek artist; the Egyptians displaying in these objects of private luxe, the taste of a highly refined people."

Winkelmann is of opinion that the Egyptians

"Carried the art of glass-making to a higher degree of perfection than ourselves, though it may appear a paradox to those who have not seen their works in this material."

Regarding their social customs, Wilkinson says:—

"In some instances, we find men and women sitting together, both strangers as well as members of the same family; a privilege not conceded to females among the Greeks, except with their relations; and this not only argues a very great advancement in civilisation, but proves, like many other Egyptian customs, how far this people excelled the Greeks in habits of social life."

Well do Dr. Birch and Mr. S. Lane-Poole remark:

"The superior position of women in the social scale.....shows that the Egyptians reached a higher point of delicacy and refinement than either their Eastern or Western successors. Colossal in art, profound in philosophy and religion, and in possession of the knowledge of the arts and sciences, Egypt exhibits the astounding phenomenon of an elevated civilisation at a period when the other nations of the world were almost unknown."

Greece imparted her civilisation to Rome, and Rome to modern Europe. Whence did Greece derive her civilisation? To this Dr. Scholes replies, after citing ancient historians like Diodorus and Herodotus, and some modern writers on the subject, that Egypt was the educator of modern Europe through Greece, that "Egyptian civilisation is to modern

civilisation what oxygen is to the air we breathe, it is its basis," and that "the spring of European art, no less than of European science, is Egypt, and not Greece." Dr. Scholes observes that "among most of our modern historians the prevailing habit is either to deny, ignore, or to deprecate the fact that the Greeks were thus obligated to the Egyptians." Nevertheless, it is a fact that Cecrops and Danaus, the leaders of the Egyptians, settled respectively in Athens and Argos, and thus contributed the largest share to the upbuilding of Greek civilisation. Modern historians who find it impossible to ignore the indebtedness of ancient Greece to Egypt, have directed their energies to proving that the ancient Egyptians were not Ethiopians. They want to retain the Aryan kinship of the ancient Egyptians at all costs. We have seen in our previous paper how the anthropometrist Nott, in his anxiety to maintain the supremacy of the white over all other races, even though they be of the 'supreme Caucasian' type, said: "the Hindoo is almost as far removed in structure from the Teuton as is the Hottentot." But when he finds it to his purpose to prove the unity of the Indo-European race in view of the possible derivation of ancient Egyptians from the Hindus, he says: "All the Caucasian families belong to that vast chain of nations called Indo-European in consequence of their having a common tongue, the Sanscrit." This veracious historian, however, holds that the ancient Egyptians were Europeans and not Hindus, which is the view propounded by another eminent ethnologist, Heeren, while a third, Featherman, surmises that they were Syrians or Assyrians. There are others, however, who could not totally ignore the evidence of history, and these, including Volney, Prichard, and Rollins, were compelled to declare in favour of their Negro origin. Dr. Scholes, analysing the philological, physical and historical evidence with great care and impartiality, arrives at the same conclusion. We therefore see

that the Negroes are now "fallen from their high estate" and that at one time their ancestors civilised modern Europe.

Mexico Let us now turn to the ancient Mexicans and Peruvians. I shall take my facts from Draper's well-known history. In Mexico, the legislative power resided in the monarch, who was, however, subject to the laws of the realm. The judges held their office independently of, and were not liable to removal by him. The laws were reduced to writing, which, though only a system of hieroglyphics, served its purpose so well that the Spaniards were obliged to admit its validity in their law courts, marriage was regarded as an important social engagement, divorces were with difficulty granted. No distinction of caste was permitted. There was a well-organised postal service of couriers. The army was provided with hospitals, army surgeons and a medical staff. The higher classes were strictly unitarian. At the conquest, the Mexican calendar was better than the Spanish. There were sun-dials, and instruments for the solstices and equinoxes. The globular form of the earth and the obliquity of the ecliptic were known. Their agriculture was superior to that of Europe; there was nothing in the old world to compare with their menageries and botanical gardens. They practised with skill delicate mechanical arts like those of the jeweller and enameller. They were skilful weavers of cloth. They knew how to move immense masses of rock. Polygamy was confined to the wealthy. Mexicans gave Europe tobacco, snuff, chocolate, cochineal. They had theatrical and pantomimic performances. The King's palace was a wonderful work of art. Its harem was adorned with magnificent tapestries of featherwork; in its garden were fountains, cascades, baths, statues, alabasters, cedar groves, forests and a wilderness of flowers. In conspicuous retirement was a temple dedicated to the omnipotent invisible God. In this no sacrifices were offered, but only sweet-scented flowers and gums.

The Peruvian civilisation was developed independently of the Mexican, as the two nations were ignorant of each other. The state of Peruvian civilisation is at once demonstrated when it is said that the mountain-slopes had become a garden, immense terraces having been constructed where required for the purposes of agriculture, and irrigation on a grander scale than that of Egypt carried on by gigantic canals and aqueducts. Two great military roads were built, one on the plateau and the other on the shore. The former for nearly two thousand miles crossed sierras covered with snow, was thrown over ravines, or went through tunnels in the rocks. Our admiration for this splendid piece of engineering is enhanced when we remember that it was accomplished without iron and gun-powder. Of these roads, Humboldt says that they were among the most useful and most stupendous ever executed by the hand of man. In Cuzco was the imperial residence of the Inca. The king's palace at Yucay is described by the Spaniards as a fairy scene. The popular religion was Sun-worship, but the higher classes believed in the one invisible God. The popular faith had a ritual and splendid ceremonial. Polygamy, though permitted, was confined to the higher classes. The people were divided into groups, and over each group of ten thousands an Inca noble presided. Through this system a rigid centralisation was insured. An annual survey of the country, its farming and mineral products was made, and the inventory transmitted to the Government. A register of births and deaths was kept, and periodically a general census was taken. "In Peru a man could not improve his social state...he could become neither richer nor poorer; but it was the boast of the system that every one lived exempt, from social suffering—that all enjoyed competence." The army consisted of two hundred thousand men. Their year was divided into months and weeks. They had gnomons to indicate the solstices. Their

writing was inferior to that of Egypt, but they had a literature consisting of poetry, dramatic compositions and the like. In Spain there was nothing that could be compared with their great water-works. The aqueduct of Condesuya was nearly five hundred miles long. "Its engineers had overcome difficulties in a manner that might well strike modern times with admiration." They built edifices of porphyry, granite and brick.

Our knowledge of Mexican history would have been much ampler than it is, but for the fact that immense quantities of Mexican literature were consigned to the flames by the Spanish Archbishop of Mexico, just as Cardinal Ximenes burnt a vast number of Arabic manuscripts at Granada at about the same time. As Draper remarks :—

"The enormous crime of Spain in destroying this civilisation has never yet been appreciated in Europe. After an attentive consideration of the facts of the case, I agree in the conclusion of Carli, that at the time of the conquest the moral man in Peru was superior to the European, and, I will add, the intellectual man also. In Spain, or even in all Europe, was there to be found a political system carried out into the practical details of actual life, and expressed in great public works as its outward, visible and enduring sign, which could at all be compared with that of Peru?"

Of the civilisation of China, it is not necessary to speak much. The Chinese system of administration is well-known. The people are remarkably chaste and honest, they are physically strong and peaceably disposed. Ma Twan Lin's Catalogue of Chinese literature is a library in itself. Printing, gun-powder and the mariner's compass are Chinese inventions. Silk and porcelain have been introduced into Europe from China. In certain of the mechanical arts, in chemistry, metallurgy, architecture, agriculture, and horticulture, the Chinese display wonderful skill. Of their manufactures one authority speaks thus :—

"The principal manufactures of the Chinese are silk, cotton, linen and pottery, for which they are especially celebrated. The finest porcelain is made in the province of Kiang-se..... Their skill in handicrafts is astonishing. Their rich silks and satins,

light gauzes, beautiful embroidery, elaborate engraving on wood and stone, delicate filigree work in gold and silver, carvings on ivory, fine lacquered ware, antique vessels in bronze, and their brilliant colouring on the fans of pith paper, command our admiration."

Draper thus speaks of the Chinese civilisation :—

"What is it that gives to her wonderful longevity ?..... The organisation of the national intellect is the principle. A broad foundation is laid in universal education. It is intended that every Chinese shall know how to read and write. The special plan then adopted is that of competitive examinations. The way to public advancement is open to all. Merit, real or supposed, is the only passport to office. Its degree determines exclusively social rank. The Government is organised on mental qualifications..... The intention is to give a dominating control to intellect..... The Chinese have heard of our discordant opinions, of our intolerance to those who differ in ideas from us, of our worship of wealth, and the honour we pay to birth ; he has heard that we sometimes commit political power to men who are so little above the animals that they can neither read nor write ; that we hold military success in esteem, and regard the profession of arms as the only suitable occupation for a gentleman. It is so long since his ancestors thought and acted in that manner that he justifies himself in regarding us as having scarcely yet emerged from the barbarian stage..... A great community aiming to govern itself by intellect rather than by coercion, is a spectacle worthy of admiration." *...

Egypt, Mexico, Peru, China, India, these are the great ancient civilisations of the non-European world and all of them were indigenous and self-developed, none produced from exotic models. It is not necessary here to dwell on ancient Hindu civilisation. The world is indebted to the Hindus, among many other inventions, for the decimal notation, for algebra and trigonometry. I refer those who want to know more on this subject, to the bibliography given at the end of Professor Macdonell's *History of Sanskrit Literature*. I shall only content myself with one or two extracts from Brennand's Hindu astronomy, which will serve to show that European writers have not been fairer to the Hindus than to the Egyptians. Says he :—

"In some quarters an attempt has been made to minimise these faculties [those of close reasoning in the science of mathematics

* For a further exposition of the Chinese position, see *Letters from John Chinaman*.

and kindred subjects even in their most abstruse aspects] upon grounds which, in the opinion of the present writer, are not only inadequate, but which show in the critics themselves a want of appreciation of the true merits of Hindu astronomy."

Again,—

"A conviction formed many years ago that the Hindus have not received the credit due to their literature and mathematical sciences from Europeans and which has been strengthened by a renewal of my study of those materials, has led me also to a desire to put before the public their system of astronomy, &c."

Of the imitative type of civilisation, as opposed to the spontaneous, the Saracenic may be mentioned as the highest non-European example. Dr. Scholes says:—

"The Greeks, so to speak, have been the instructors as we have seen, of both the Romans and the Saracens. The Romans were of the same race as the Greeks, whilst the Saracens were Semitic. But although linked in the one case by the affinity of race, yet which of these two peoples, trained by the same master—the Greeks—has in mental calibre borne the closer resemblance to its teacher? Certainly it is the Saracens, who in poetry, philosophy, science and letters, revealed the Greek cast of intellect."

Mr. Ameer Ali's *Short History of the Saracens* is now a text book in Indian colleges, and only a brief notice of that wonderful people is therefore necessary to illustrate the above eulogistic observation.

At a time when a pall of dense ignorance and barbarism enveloped the white races of Europe, the Arabs alone held aloft the torch of learning. The history of the Abbasside dynasty of Bagdad, the Fatemite dynasty of Cairo and the Omureyade dynasty of Cordova,—all of which flourished between the 8th to the 13th century of the Christian Era—reads like a romance. Under Harun Al-Rachid and his successor, Al-Mamun, Bagdad attained the acme of civilisation. There all the known sciences were cultivated. Philosophy, *belles lettres*, mathematics, astronomy, medicine, algebra, chemistry, land-surveying, botany, geology, natural history, were cultivated with equal avidity. "When Europe was hardly more enlightened than Caffraria is now, the Saracens were cultivating and creating

science," says Draper. The empire of the Moors abounded in extensive libraries, and the books ranged over the whole course of the domain of intellect, romances and tales, history, jurisprudence, politics, philosophy, travels, biography, books of reference, encyclopædias. The philosophy of Averroes is akin to the Vedānta of the Hindus, "Rationalism acquired a predominance such as it has perhaps not gained even in modern times in European countries." "The vast literature," says Sedillot, "which existed during this period, the multifarious productions of genius, the precious inventions, all of which attest a marvellous activity of intellect, justify the opinion that *the Arabs were our masters in everything*. They furnished us on the one hand with inestimable materials for the history of the middle ages, with travels, with the happy idea of biographical dictionaries; on the other, an industry without equal, architecture magnificent in execution and thought, and important discoveries in art." The palace of Alhambra in Granada has been aptly called 'a fabric of the genii.' Persons having a taste for learning flocked to the Moorish Universities of Spain from all parts of Europe. Gebert passed from the infidel university of Cordova to the papacy of Rome. The English monk Abelard found a refuge there. Nowhere was ornamental gardening better understood. To the Saracens we are indebted for many of our personal comforts. To quote again the words of Draper:—

"Scarcely had the Arabs firmly settled in Spain before they commenced a brilliant career. Adopting what had now become the established policy of the Commanders of the Faithful in Asia, the Khalifs of Cordova distinguished themselves as patrons of learning, and set an example of refinement strongly contrasting with the condition of the native European princes. Cordova, under their administration, at its highest point of prosperity, boasted of two hundred thousand houses, and more than a million of inhabitants. After sunset, a man might walk through it in a straight line for ten miles by the light of the public lamps. Seven hundred years after this time, there was not so much as one public lamp in London. Its streets were solidly paved. In Paris, centuries subsequently, whoever stepped over his threshold on a rainy day stepped up to his ankles in mud.....Those sovereigns might well look down with supercilious contempt on

the dwellings of the rulers of Germany, France and England, which were scarcely better than stables..... No nation has ever excelled the Spanish Arabs in the beauty and costliness of their pleasure gardens..... In the midst of all this luxury,.....the Spanish Khalifs, emulating the example of their Asiatic compeers, and in this strongly contrasting with the Popes of Rome, were not only the patrons, but the personal cultivators of all the branches of human learning..... The Mahomedan liberality was in striking contrast with the intolerance of Europe. Indeed, it may be doubted whether at this time any European nation is sufficiently advanced to follow their example..... How different was the state of all this from the state of things in Europe! The Christian peasant, fever-stricken or overtaken by an accident, hied to the nearest saint-shrine and expected a miracle; the Spanish Moor relied on the prescription or lancet of his physician, or the bandage and knife of his surgeon..... While Constantinople and Rome were asserting, in all its absurdity, the flatness of the earth, the Spanish Moors were teaching geography in their common schools from globes."

The general standard of European civilisation at the time will appear from the conduct of the crusaders, and the contrast they presented to the army of Saladin. "Even down to the meanest camp-follower," says Draper, "every one must have recognised the difference between what they had anticipated and what they had found. They had seen undaunted courage, chivalrous bearing, intellectual culture far higher than their own." Michaud says that in Asia, the first crusaders "committed crimes which make nature shudder," and that they "forgot Constantinople and Jerusalem in tumultuous scenes of debauchery," and "pillage, violation and murder were everywhere left on the traces of their passage." "If contemporary accounts are to be credited, all the vices of the infamous Babylon prevailed among the liberators of Sion." Of the eighth crusade he says, "Beneath the shadow of the standard of Christ the crusaders gave themselves up to all the excesses of debauchery; the contagion of the most odious vices pervaded all ranks." Similar is the testimony of Joinville and Gibbon. According to Von Sybel, Mills, and many other writers, cannibalism was openly practised among the lower ranks of the crusaders.

European historians have pursued a similar course-

towards the Saracens as they have done towards the ancient Egyptians and Hindus. This is what Draper says in this connection :—

"I have to deplore the systematic manner in which the literature of Europe has contrived to put out of sight our scientific obligations to the Mahomedans. Surely they cannot be much longer hidden. Injustice founded on religious rancour and national conceit cannot be perpetuated for ever.....The Arab has left his intellectual impress on Europe, as, before long, Christendom shall have to confess ; he has indelibly written it on the heavens, as everyone may see who reads the names of the stars on a common celestial globe."

In another book, referring to the conspiracy of silence among European writers with regard to the contributions of the Saracens to the cause of civilisation, Draper says :—

"It has been their constant practice to hide what they could not depreciate, and depreciate what they could not hide."

But the indebtedness of modern Europe to the Moorish culture can no longer be concealed : through Spain and Constantinople, Saracenic culture has descended to modern Europe. "The pagan literature of antiquity," says Lecky, "and the Mahomedan schools of science, were the chief agencies in resuscitating the dormant energies of Christendom." *Ex oriente lux*.

The empire of the Moors was overthrown by Ferdinand and Isabella, and soon after Torquemada, with his horrible inquisition, established a reign of terror in Spain. In the eloquent language of Conde, himself a Spaniard,—

"An eternal gloom envelopes the countries which their presence had brightened and enriched. Nature has not changed ; she is as smiling as ever ; but the people and their religion have changed. Some mutilated monuments still dominate over the ruins which cover a desolate land ; but from the midst of these monuments, of these cold ruins, comes the cry of Truth, 'Honour and glory to the vanquished Arab, decay and misery for the conquering Spaniards.'"

Stanley Lane Poole says as follows on the loss inflicted by Christian fanaticism in Spain :—

"The misguided Spaniards knew not what they were doing..... They did not understand that they had killed their golden goose. For centuries Spain had been the centre of civilisation, the seat

of arts and sciences, of learning and every form of refined enlightenment. No other country in Europe had so far approached the cultivated dominion of the Moors.....The Moors were banished; for a while Christian Spain shone, like the moon, with a borrowed light; then came the eclipse, and in that darkness Spain has grovelled ever since."

A dip into the history of ancient Egypt, India, Mexico, Peru, China* and the Saracens, therefore shows, that the proposition in favour of the supposed innate superiority of the white races is absolutely baseless; the arguments advanced in support of the theory being characterised by Dr. Schöle as "a mangled medley of sophistries, prepared on the Procrustean plan, by mutilating facts, which are either lengthened or shortened in accordance with the requirements of the bed, 'Caucasian superiority'." We shall now offer a few observations on the favorite doctrines of Henry Thomas Buckle, the representative in England of a class of historians whose aim is to identify all branches of human knowledge with modern white races; who, in his *History of Civilisation*—a book which at one time used to be widely read in this country—had the audacity to perpetrate the following sentence:

"In these four countries [Mexico, Peru, India, Egypt]...there existed an amount of knowledge despicable if tried by an European standard," &c.

* "Western surgery is just now credited with performing marvels—all of which are said to be the invention and product of Western brains. Those who are of this opinion would do well to read the paper read by Mr. James Cantile at the Caxton Hall the other day on 'China in its medical aspects.' Mr. Cantile said with great truth that the Chinese, who were the most intellectual race on the face of the earth, developed the science of medicine about 2,000 years before Christ. Six hundred years before Christ an excellent study of the pulse was written. Then there was a surgeon who performed an abdominal operation, every detail of which anticipated Listerism. There was no regular, medical education, and the Chinese surgeons were trained by being apprenticed to other surgeons. It was remarkable to compare ancient Chinese surgery with modern Western surgery. for they would find that many of the methods of treatment which people in the West thought were of quite recent discovery, were invented and used in ordinary practice in the East 3,000 years ago."—*Amrita Bazar Patrika*, January, 1909.

According to Buckle, the chief factors in the evolution of civilisation are (1) soil (2) climate (3) food and (4) aspects of nature. The cause of the early development of civilisation in Egypt, India, Mexico and Peru is explained by him by the fact that in those countries a fertile soil yielded an abundant harvest and led to a rapid accumulation of wealth but owing to the same cause man became indolent and civilisation was arrested and gradually fell into decay. Similarly, the climate of Europe being cold, evoked the energy of man and led to his steady progress. Where the climate is extremely cold, however, as in Sweden and Norway, or where it is comparatively warm, as in Spain and Portugal, labour becomes fickle and unstable, whereas in the more temperate regions of Europe the people show a capacity for a steady and unflinching industry. A temperate climate is, therefore, the best for the growth of civilisation. In regard to the aspects of nature, Buckle holds that in Asia, Africa and America, high mountains and great rivers, earthquakes, hurricanes and pestilence, aroused the imagination of man and made him superstitious; in Italy, where according to Buckle, the same conditions prevail, the excess of imagination has developed the artistic talent, whereas in countries where the aspects of nature are neither terrible nor grand, nothing interfered with the peaceful development of the intellect.

*Buckle
referred to*

As to the effect of food on civilisation, Buckle speaks as follows :—

"The diet of hot countries, by its cheapness, the ease with which it is procured, and the smallness of the amount required for the individual, increases population; while the diet of cold countries, for reasons the very opposite of those just given, restricts the growth of population. The result being, in the case of the labouring class in the tropics, poverty and submission, whereas in colder climates the democratic spirit has prevailed, manifesting itself in revolutions, insurrections, &c."

So far as India is concerned, the following extract from an article by the Rev. J. T. Sunderland in the *New England Magazine* for September 1900, will

sufficiently demonstrate the falsity of this specious theory :—

"The population of India is not so dense as in a number of States of Europe, which are prosperous, have no difficulty in supporting their people, and in which famines are never dreamt of. Nor is the birthrate high in India. It is less than in England, and much less than in Germany, and several other continental countries. Indeed it is 75 per 1000 less than the average birthrate of all Europe. India is not over-populated."

I shall now make an extract from Dr. Scholes which will, I trust, dispose of the other theories regarding soil, climate and aspects of nature, associated with the name of Buckle :—

*Revision
of
Scholes.*

"We are told that these civilisations [those of Mexico, Peru, India and Egypt] are the results primarily of fertile soil, coupled with the absence in those places of certain natural phenomena. But situated in the same latitudes equally favoured by soil, and by the absence of restrictive natural phenomena, are regions which, in their sum total, quadrate with those other regions that have produced civilisations. Yet these regions [e.g. Northern Australasia, the islands of the Pacific, and California] have remained uniformly barbarous. Therefore, is it logical to conclude that the civilisations of those more enlightened states are due to soil? If so then to what is the backwardness of the uncivilised regions due? For they are in the same latitudes as the civilised; they have the same fertility; and they also enjoy, like these civilised regions, immunity from oppressive aspects of nature. Secondly, we are told that the civilisation of Europe is chiefly the result of its temperate climate, and that its extreme cold in the North, and its severe heat in the South, have produced in the inhabitants of those parts fickleness and instability of character. But seeing that the same temperate climate as that of Europe failed to produce a civilisation among the North American Indians, seeing that civilisations (Roman and Grecian), as high as those in the more temperate parts of Europe, have likewise been produced in the South, seeing that those peoples were neither unstable nor fickle, and seeing also that in latitudes corresponding, on the American Continent, to the area of extreme cold and to the area of extreme heat in Europe, civilisations (Canadian and American) like those of the more temperate regions of Europe have been produced, and that the peoples are neither unstable nor fickle, is the theory sustained, that makes the temperate climate a chief cause of civilisation? Buckle, as we have seen, regards soil and climate as two of the chief causes of civilisation... Lastly, as for the aspects of nature influencing the imagination to an abnormal degree in hot countries, we have taken the Italians, who are said to have been so influenced; we have compared them to their sires, the ancient occupiers of the peninsula, and we have

seen that upon the ancients the phenomena of nature produced no such effect: hence, granting that the Italians are specially imaginative and superstitious, the assertion that the excessive growth of the imagination is due to climate is disproved, and since there is no better proof regarding the Spaniards and Portuguese, this same assertion with respect to them is likewise disproved. Again, taking India, whose superstition Buckle has cited in order to prove the predominating power of the imagination in tropical and subtropical peoples, we have compared a specimen of that superstition produced by its imagination with a specimen produced by the imagination of Europe, and I believe it will not be honestly denied, that a similarity, rather than a dissimilarity, exists between the specimens. Therefore, from all these facts, I conclude, that the proposition brought forward by Buckle that food, climate, soil, and the aspects of nature 'originated the most important consequences in regard to the general organisation of society,' or are the chief causes of civilisation, is not only not proved, but is, by the very arguments with which he supports that proposition, disproved."

Buckle himself has been compelled to admit that "of the two classes of laws which regulate the progress of mankind, the mental class is more important than the physical." This makes his reliance on physical phenomena alone all the more strange and remarkable. The German political philosopher Bluntschli says of Buckle that "like all Englishmen, he lays too much stress on economical conditions," Can statesmen remedy the evil effects of unfavourable physical conditions? he enquires, and replies, "They can, if they are seriously devoted to the work of advancing a healthy national life." The whole question, therefore, depends upon the personal equation of the ruling section of the community. Bluntschli agrees with Buckle in thinking that a moderately fertile soil is the best. But he is careful to add, "Doubtless history proves that these conditions do not necessarily lead to an equal distribution of wealth and a healthy national life, and there are many other more powerful factors involved." Again he says:—

"But we must not exaggerate the importance of natural phenomena. After all, less depends on them than on the moral and intellectual education of man by man. Even in hot countries reason may be educated and fancy curbed by a feeling for the beautiful; and superstition may grow rank and thought be choked under a temperate sky. Man is not the creature of natural

forces : he must face nature boldly and independently, making use of her when she is kind, and combating her when she is cruel."

Buckle would destroy the self-confidence of the non-European, Bluntschli would encourage it. Referring to Buckle's services his editor, Mr. Robertson, says that Buckle was a pioneer, but not the final and accurate codifier of sociological law. Mr. Robertson thus observes that—

"The early Mediterranean civilisation grew from Asiatic seed, and the northern civilisations from the Mediterranean. But for these transmissions of culture, there is no reason to suppose that northern Europe would have emerged from barbarism."

To rectify Buckle's exposition, therefore,

"We have to note that the higher European civilisation is derivative, first by way of mediterranean contacts with the civilisations of Egypt and Western Asia, then by way of Mediterranean contacts with northern barbarism."

So much for Buckle and his theories. He is one of a class of historians which, according to Dr. Scholes, "pursues truth, in order that securing from it a badge, or symbol, it may with the same decorate some conventional prejudice, or political crime." European historians have taught us much for which we are sincerely grateful, but let us abjure with all our might their detestable habit of "cooking" facts to feed their national vanity. Dr. Scholes has adopted "*Fiat justitia, ruat cælum*" as the motto of his book, and he has rendered a real service to the cause of truth and humanity by exposing in all its ugly nakedness, the infamous attempt of some English and American historians and pseudo-scientists to set up the false theory of white superiority as an immutable law—a theory which was propounded with the sole object of justifying political crime.

THE PLACE OF INDIA IN THE
BROTHERHOOD OF NATIONS

BY THE REV. J. T. SUNDERLAND, M.A., D.D.

Surely there is no higher ideal than that of human brotherhood, and no nobler purpose for which any of us can work than to promote such an ideal. But we should bear in mind that human brotherhood has its basis in the soul. There can be no brotherhood where one nation looks down upon another nation, or one class of persons upon another class, with ignorant prejudice or with arroganee or contempt. There can be human brotherhood only where there is intelligence and sympathy.

When we approach India in connection with the thought of human brotherhood or the brotherhood of nations, we find ourselves confronted with several rather serious difficulties. The first of all is this—the fact that India is an Asiatic land and the Indian people an Asiatic people. Europe, you know, for many generations (and largely also America, because we are children of Europe and the inheritors of her prejudices) has looked down with contempt upon Asia and every thing Oriental. This is a strange condition of things, for Asia is what? She is the great mother continent. She is the mother of races, the mother of nations, the mother of languages, the mother of the arts and more than any other continent the mother of the world's higher life. Our own civilisation (that of Europe and America) sends its roots back in almost every particular, into Asia. Why then

should we look down upon Asia ? All the great historic religions of the world come from Asia. Why should we have prejudice against the continent from which we get our Bible and our religious faith ? And yet we do. Europe has treated Asia for generations with contempt and cruelty in more ways than I can stop to explain or intimate. This fact, then, that India is in Asia, is one of the obstacles in the way of getting our minds into a condition to appreciate India and to open a way for a real brotherhood between ourselves and the Indian people.

Another obstacle exists in the fact that India is what we call a "heathen" land. We have long been sending our missionaries to convert the Hindu, concerning whom we sing,

"The heathen in his blindness
Bows down to wood and stone."

Does not the word "heathen" as employed by us always have in it an element of the contemptuous ? Is it not partly synonymous with savage or uncivilised ? As Christians, are we not apt to regard ourselves as distinctly superior to the "heathen" not only in religion but in civilization ? Indeed does not the very act of sending missionaries to a people seem to set up a claim to superiority on our part, which is not conducive to the spirit of brotherhood ? If our missionaries were always broad-minded, possibly this would not be so. But missionaries are not always the broadest men. Indeed, missionary societies seem generally to feel the necessity of sending out men who are "theologically sound," which is apt to mean men who are narrow, who have little inclination to recognise the best that is in the religion and the civilization of the people among whom they labour. This we must always bear in mind when we read or hear accounts of India given by missionaries. If the missionaries were to come back from India reporting that they find there people equally intelligent with ourselves, as virtuous as ourselves, having as great purity in their homes

as we have in ours, and as upright in character as are the people of America, what would be the effect of their reports upon the home churches? At once the inquiry would be raised, Why send our missionaries? Why have missionary societies? Thus we see that the pressure upon missionaries is very strong not to report at home the better side of Indian thought and life, but to confine their reports to the lowest and worst side,—the result of which must, of course, be to give us anything but the true India.

As a fact, too (and this should not be overlooked), few of the missionaries come in contact with or see the best of Indian life. The people whom they are able to reach with their Gospel are largely of the lowest, most ignorant, and most degraded classes. The intelligence of India, the literature and art and better religious thought of India and the civilization of the land in its higher forms, they know comparatively little about. Thus we see how unfortunate it is that the Western world is compelled to get its knowledge of India so largely through Christian missionaries, who, however good men they may be, must in the nature of the case give us more or less inadequate and biased reports. When the people of India are represented to us in such a way as to cause us to look down upon them, if not with pride and arrogance, at least with pity born of condescension, the conditions essential for a genuine feeling of human brotherhood between us and them are destroyed.

Another difficulty which meets us when we come to talk about India in connection with human brotherhood is this: India is a subject land,—a dependency of Great Britain; it is not an independent nation. Its people are held in subjection by the sword of an alien power; they are not permitted to shape their own political destinies, but are ruled wholly by foreign masters. This condition of subjection is not only humiliating in the highest degree but it is degrading. It is destructive of brotherhood. Of course there can be no political fraternity between

any independent nation and a people held in political bondage.

India is deprived of the privileges and the rights of free nations, in many ways. Let me point out one or two.

She is permitted to have no representation in the diplomatic life and service of the world. If we go to Washington, what do we find? Every independent nation of any importance has its ambassador or minister, or representative of some rank there. Is there any representative from India? None. Yet India is a country of 315,000,000 people,—twice as large in population as Russia. Is India represented at any of the courts of Europe? Not one. Could a country be in a more humiliating position? Could the principles of brotherhood between nations and peoples be worse outraged?

Compare India with Japan and China in a single particular. Japan has sent large number of her finest young men to America and Europe to enter our universities and technical schools, in order that, after getting the best knowledge and training that our institutions can afford, they might go back and become teachers of this knowledge in all parts of their own land. This is largely the explanation of the rapid progress which she has made during the past forty years. China is following Japan's example. There are now between 400 and 500 Chinese students in American institutions of learning and more are coming. Through these young men China will obtain for herself the best training, the knowledge, the best intellectual and moral help that the West can afford her. When these students return to their own country, they will be put by the Chinese government into places of influence and leadership all over the Empire.

India would like to send her young men to this country in the same way that Japan and China have done, to get our science and technical training for India's benefit. Hundreds of thousands of the people of India are eager for knowledge and progress. A

few Indian young men have already come here. But does the Indian government prepare the way for them and send them, as the governments of China and Japan do, and as the Indian government would do if India were free and self-ruling? Far from that. It puts obstacles in their way. It sets detectives from Scotland Yard on their track to see what they are doing here. They are suspected and watched. The government of India does not want her young men to go away and get the knowledge of the Western world, and especially she does not want them to get it in America, where they will breathe the atmosphere of liberty. When these few young men, who in spite of opposition have made their way to America for study, return to India, will the government place them in positions where they can make the best use of their knowledge and training for the benefit of their country? Instead of that the government will neglect them, hinder them, discriminate against them, and give nearly every place of influence and importance not to them but to young Englishmen. This is what it means to India to be a subject land. This is how imperialism, the practice of one nation ruling another without its consent, destroys human brotherhood.

Another thought is of interest in connection with students coming to this country from oriental lands. The Japanese and Chinese young men who come to study here render us a valuable service by helping us to understand China and Japan. They show us the better side of those countries. When they pass through our universities in the same classes with our own best young men, and do their work as well and take as high honours, they do much to cure us of our prejudices against oriental peoples; they let us see that China and Japan are not to be despised, but that their people are the equal of ourselves. Thus they accomplish something important in the direction of promoting brotherhood between the Orient and the Occident. If students could come in numbers from India they would render us a like service in

letting us see the better side of India, and showing us that the Indian people also are worthy of a place beside the people of the Western world. Thus would human brotherhood in the world be still further promoted.

I have spoken of the misfortune it is, both to us and to the Indian people, that so much of our knowledge of India comes through the medium of missionaries, who, in the nature of the case, can hardly be unprejudiced reporters. It is quite as great a misfortune that our other principal source of information regarding India is the English rulers of the land, who, by the very fact that they are foreign conquerors and rulers, are as little fitted to give unprejudiced information as are the missionaries. Of course, many of the English in India are as honest and sincere persons as we are, and as desirous of seeing and telling the truth. But consider the situation they are in. They are foreigners, ruling the Indian people without their consent. They want to justify themselves for being in the land. It would be impossible for them to see and represent matters otherwise than from their own side.

Was it possible for us in the days of American slavery to get unbiased information concerning the slaves and slavery from the slave-holders? Were they not a prejudiced body of men? Many of them were good men, many of them were intelligent, many of them intended to be honourable, but in the very nature of the case they were prejudiced, and their views and reports concerning slavery were biased. The same is true with regard to the British in India. The men who go from England to India and spend years in the government's service there, and then come back to interpret India, to write books concerning India, to write articles on India in papers and magazines, to give to the Western world, including America, its ideas of India—these men are as much biased regarding the Indian people and Indian matters generally as were our slave-holders biased concerning slavery and the Southern Negro.

We must always bear this in mind in reading or hearing British representations of the Indian situation.

In attempting to justify herself before the world for holding India in subjection, of course it is natural for England to try to make out that the Indian people are an inferior race. Well, as a fact, what is their race? The higher castes of India belong to the same ethnic family with you and me. They are Aryans; they are cousins of the Greeks and the Romans, the Germans and the English. This is not a very inferior race.

Furthermore, the English are tempted all the while to represent the Indian civilisation as lower than it is. But what are the facts? India was a great civilised land long before England emerged from barbarism. She possessed one of the oldest and finest civilisations of the ancient world. The three great literatures of the ancient world that have come down to us are the Greek, the Latin, and the Indian. If we were to ask for the five or six greatest epic poems of mankind we should have to take two of them from India. If we sought for the language which, ethnologically and historically, is the most important in the world, I suppose we should have to go to the Sanscrit of India for it. Scholars are disposed to regard this ancient language of India as the most perfect of all languages in structure and development, not even excepting the Greek. The Indian people have given to the world some of its greatest philosophical systems, worthy to stand beside those of Greece and Germany. They have given the world some of its best art, of several different kinds. These are the people that England finds herself all the while under pressure (under pressure because she wants to find an excuse for ruling them) to write down, and to make out to be inferior to what they really are.

Another excuse that England puts forth for being in India is the need of her presence there to keep the peace, to prevent the Indian people "from flying at ^(v) *to India* *Peaceful*

each other's throats." But what are the facts? So far as we can find out from history India has always been a more peaceable land than Europe. We get trace of no wars in India so bad as the Thirty Years' War in Germany. There are none that compare in bloodshed with the Napoleonic Wars and none so destructive of both property and life as our own Civil War in America. And yet would some foreign nation, some China, that happened to possess a high quality of firearms, be justified in conquering all Europe and holding it in subjection in order to keep the peoples of Europe from flying at each other's throats? Or would the same foreign nation be justified in conquering and ruling America in the same way, because of our terrible Civil War?

It is said that India is incapable of ruling herself. If so, what an indictment is this against England! She was not incapable of ruling herself before England came. Have one hundred and fifty years of English tutelage produced in her such deterioration? As we have seen, she was possessed of high civilisation and of developed government long before England or any part of Europe had emerged from barbarism. For three hundred years before England's arrival, Indian kingdoms and empires had held leading places in Asia. Some of the ablest rulers, statesmen, and financiers of the world have been of India's production. How is it, then, that she loses her ability to govern herself as soon as England appears upon the scene? To be sure, at that time she was in a peculiarly disorganised and unsettled state; for it should be remembered that the Mogul Empire was just breaking up, new political adjustments were everywhere just being made—a fact which accounts for England's being able to gain a political foothold in India. But everything indicates that if India had not been interfered with by European powers, she would soon have been under competent government of her own again.

A further answer to the assertion that India cannot govern herself and surely one that should be con-

clusive, is the fact that, in parts, she is governing herself now, and governing herself well. It is notorious that the very best government in India today is not that carried on by the British, but that of several of the native States, notably Baroda and Mysore. For you know there are certain native States which, while in a general way under British rule, are yet allowed to manage their own affairs to some extent. In these States, particularly in Baroda, the people are more free, more prosperous, more contented, and are making more progress, than in any other part of India. Note the superiority of both these States in the important matter of popular education. Mysore is spending on education more than three times as much per capita as is British India, while Baroda has made her education free and compulsory, a thing which no part of British India has dreamt of. Both of these States, but especially Baroda, which has thus placed herself in line with the leading nations of Europe and America by making provisions for the education of all her children, may well be contrasted with British India, which provides education, even of the poorest kind, for only one boy in ten and one girl in one hundred and forty-four.

The truth is, not one single fact can be cited that goes to show that India cannot govern herself—reasonably well at first, excellently well later—if only given a chance. It would not be difficult to form an Indian parliament to-day, composed of men as able and of as high character as those that constitute the fine parliament of Japan or as those that will be certain to constitute the not less able national parliament of China when the new constitutional government of that nation comes into operation. This is only another way of saying that among the leaders in the various states and provinces of India there is abundance of material to form an Indian National Parliament not inferior in intellectual ability or in moral worth to the parliaments of the Western world.

There is a new spirit in India, there is a new rising

of hope and determination among the Indian people, which is taking shape in the "New National Movement." It is the awakening and the protest of a subject people. It is the effort of a nation, once illustrious, and still conscious of its inherent superiority, to rise from the dust, to stand once more on its feet, to shake off fetters which have become unendurable. It is the effort of the Indian people to get for themselves again a country which shall be in some true sense their own, instead of remaining, as for a century and a half it has been, a mere preserve of a foreign power,—in John Stuart Mill's words, England's "cattle-farm". The people of India want the freedom which is their right,—freedom to shape their own institutions, their own industries, their own national life. They want a recognised and an honorable place both in the great brotherhood of humanity and in the great brotherhood of nations. They ought to have it.

Let me not be misunderstood. These does not necessarily mean—and this is clearly recognised by the leaders of the Indian people—separation from Great Britain; but it does mean, if retaining a connection with the British Empire, becoming citizens, and not remaining forever helpless subjects and voteless helots in the hands of irresponsible masters. It does mean that India shall be given a place in the Empire essentially like that of Canada or Australia, with such autonomy and home rule as are enjoyed by these free, self-governing colonies. Is not this demand just? Not only the people of India, but many of the best Englishmen, answer unequivocally, Yes! In the arduous struggle upon which India has entered to attain this end—and arduous indeed her struggle must be, for holders of autocratic and irresponsible power seldom in this world surrender their power without being compelled—surely she should have the sympathy of the enlightened and liberty-loving men and women of all nations.

HOME RULE AMONG SAVAGES IN THE BRITISH EMPIRE

There is an extensive archipelago in the mid-western Pacific Ocean belonging to Great Britain called the Gilbert (Kingsmill) Islands. In spite of adverse conditions of environment and complete barbarism, says the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, the population of these islands is exceedingly dense, in strong contradistinction to that of many other more favoured islands. The land area of the group is only 166 square miles, yet the population is about 30,000. The Gilbert Islanders are a dark and coarse type of the Polynesian race, and show signs of much crossing. They are tall and stout, with an average height of five feet eight inches, and are of a vigorous and energetic temperament. They are nearly always naked, but wear a conical hat of pandanus leaf. In war they have an armour of plaited cocoanut fibres. They are fierce fighters, their chief weapon being a sword armed with shark's teeth. Their canoes are well made of cocoanut wood boards sewn neatly together and fastened on frames. The large population led to the introduction of natives from these islands into Hawaii as labourers in 1878-1884, but they were not found satisfactory. These islands were taken under British protection in 1892.

The Ellice Islands, situated nearly midway between Fiji and Gilbert, were also taken under protection in 1892. Their total area is 14 square miles, and the population is about 2400. Some of them speak the language of the Gilbert islanders, and have a tradition that they came some generations ago from that group. All the others are of Samoan speech.

Mr. E. C. Eliot, Resident Commissioner in these islands, contributed an interesting article on them

to the December (1915) number of *United Empire*, the Royal Colonial Institute journal, in which he calls them a model protectorate. He says that by an Order in Council gazetted November 12, 1915, the native Governments of the Gilbert and Ellice Islands, which were proclaimed as British Protectorates in 1892, have been, at their own desire, annexed to His Majesty's Dominions. They are to be known as the Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony. This Colony, of which the population is according to the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, in a state of "complete barbarism," enjoys the natural right of Home Rule. We will quote the exact words of Mr. Eliot: "To-day a state of 'Home Rule' exists which is probably unique among native races under the protection of the British Crown. With their own code of native laws, revised and amended by a King's Regulation, the people are wisely and justly ruled by their own councils of Chiefs and Elders under the advice and guidance of the few European officials who assist the Resident Commissioner as administrative officers in charge of a number of islands." We take a few more details from Mr. Eliot's interesting article.

The following constitute the native courts:—The native Magistrate, the Chief of Kaubere, members of Kaubere, the Scribe, the Island Police; other native officials being the prison warder and wardress and hospital orderly.

The "Kaubere" (in the Ellice Islands "Kaupoli"); is composed of Chiefs and Elders, the number varying according to the size and population of the island, from about thirty-five to six or seven. The meetings of the Kaubere are called the "Bowi," and are held monthly, though special meetings may be convened more often should necessity arise.

These meetings of the "Bowi" are divided into two sittings. The first comprises the criminal jurisdiction at which the Native Magistrate presides and passes sentence; the Kaubere acting as his advisers. The Magistrate must take the opinion of all members of the Kaubere who may be present, and he then decides

on the punishment by the guidance of his Book of the Laws, which is printed in the vernacular.

After the criminal cases are disposed of, it is usual for the Chief of Kaubere to relieve the Magistrate as spokesman. All complaints are then heard, reports received from Kaubere in charge of villages and from individuals. Land disputes are looked into and adjusted and all matters affecting the welfare of the community are brought up for discussion. The Gilbert islander is a born orator, and though his tones may be raucous to our ears, his graceful and expressive movements at once command attention.

Every island is equipped with a well appointed hospital, and gaols for males and females ; unfortunately, in many instances, a leper station has also to be included.

From end to end of each island excellent roads extend which are kept up by free labour. The inhabitants take much pride in their roads, so much so that it is a criminal offence for a native to pass without removing a branch, or any obstruction which may be lying in the path. This system of free communal work is not abused ; though a relic of former years, it is freely given, and has the great advantage of permitting the imposition of far lighter taxation than would otherwise be necessary.

The revenue of the Protectorate is derived from a light land tax, payable in copra, and graded according to the size, population, and prosperity of each island. In times of drought, to which the Central Gilbert Islands are especially subject, this tax is reduced or wholly remitted. Import duties are charged only on wines, malt liquor, and spirits (which does not affect the native population, since the sale or consumption of all intoxicating liquor is forbidden to them by law), tobacco, scents, and kerosene.

In addition to the Island Police, who are directly responsible to the Native Governments, there is a Protectorate Police Force of about fifty men, who are divided between Ocean Island and Tarawa in the Gilberts, which latter island was at one time the seat

of Government. The members of the Protectorate Police Force were originally enrolled from Fiji; but these men are now being replaced by Gilbert and Ellice natives, who have proved themselves both willing and competent to deal with brother delinquents. It is regarded as a special honour to belong to the Protectorate Force, and the pick of the islands can therefore be obtained.

Small retaining fees are paid to Native Island Magistrates, Chiefs of Kaubere, Scribes, Island Police, warders, and hospital orderlies; in the cases of the Native Magistrates and Chiefs of Kaubere, these small payments can only be regarded as sufficient to meet "out of pocket" travelling expenses, and in no way detract from the credit of the good work which these officials willingly give for the welfare of their people. The Chief of Kaubere is generally, but not necessarily, the hereditary Chief of the Island. He patrols the island, and sees that the village Kaubere and Police attend to their duties. There is one Kaubere at least to every village, and in a large island, such as Tabiteuea in the Gilbert Group—which is over fifty miles in length—there are about thirty villages. The members of the Kaubere are unpaid.

The Island Native Scribe deserves a special word of praise. Though he is the clerk to the Native Government and the custodian of the purse, he is generally a man of substance and position. Since the year 1892, when the Flag was hoisted in these Protectorates, there has been but one case recorded of embezzlement by a Scribe, and although many months may pass without the possibility of a visit from a Protectorate official, it is seldom that the cash is wrong by so much as a penny. Even to-day comparatively few islands can boast the possession of a safe, but the Island funds are as secure in an old box with the flimsiest of locks as they could be at home in the latest "burglar-proof" safe.

What should be attributed the present law-abiding, moral and happy existence of these children

of nature? In years gone by, they were great warriors; but cannibalism has never been proved, and it is doubtful if it ever existed in these islands of the Pacific. The earlier traders and settlers did their best to ruin the natives by inflaming their passions with drink and, in those bad days, the only restraining influence was that of the Missions.

With the advent of the Flag, and drastic regulations forbidding the sale of liquor and the use of firearms, peace was soon restored, and to-day it is difficult to realise that not many years have passed since the time of R. L. Stevenson, when drunken orgies were prolonged into weeks, when the crews of trading vessels were attacked and murdered, and when the daily occupation of the old chief of Butaritari was to sit on the beach with his rifle across his knees, picking off any of his labourers toiling at the construction of his sea wall whose movements did not please him. The sea wall stands inspite of the heavy westerly gales to which it is exposed, testifying to the accuracy of the aim of the Chief in picking off defaulters, and three of his grandsons are members of the Butaritari brass band, which provides a large volume of sound under the guiding baton of a father of the Sacred Heart Mission.

The answer may be that these islanders are, at heart, nature's gentlemen: the spirit of lying and deceit is not in them. They have been scotched, but not spoilt, by contact with some of the worst evils of civilisation, during which time the unselfish devotion of the white missionary checked, to a great extent, the damage which must otherwise have been done.

Another important factor is believed to be the continuance of the system of communal work. This has without doubt had the effect not only of combating that inertia which is generally found among tropical races for whose maintenance the soil provides with the minimum expenditure of labour, but further of fostering a pride in taking a part in

the social well-being of the community. From the Magistrate and Chief of Kaubere to the ordinary labourer, every male between the ages of sixteen and sixty takes his share in the upkeep of his island. There is friendly rivalry as to which island can build the largest and finest "maneaba" or meeting house: and should it become necessary to infuse energy into road-cleaning, &c., it is sufficient for the inspecting official to contrast the state of the work on one island with that of the last visited.

A perusal of Mr. Eliot's article raises the question whether it is barbarism or civilisation which unfits men for Home Rule. Whatever Anglo-Indians may think, Indians should not be so servile as not to have the courage to believe that they are fit for Home Rule.

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN ANCIENT INDIA

The period mainly dealt with in Dr. Pramathanath Banerji's work on Public Administration in Ancient India is the millennium 500 B. C. to 500 A. D., but, occasionally, references have been made to earlier and later periods. In Ancient India, the different branches of knowledge were grouped under four heads, namely, Philosophy (Anviksiki), the Vedas (Trayi), Economics (Varta), and the Science of Government (Dandaniti). The Mahabharata says: "When the science of Politics is neglected, the three Vedas as well as all virtues decline." The Arthasastra of Chanakya is the most important of the works which treat especially of the subject of Public Administration. The political doctrine preached in this book, namely, that the end justi-

fies the means, marks a notable departure from the high moral standard of earlier times. Chanakya was a contemporary of Aristotle. He has sometimes been compared to Machiavelli, but, according to Dr. Banerjea, 'in intellectual acumen and in comprehensiveness of outlook, Kautilya far surpasses his Italian rival.' Megasthenes's description of the Punjab brings out the relation between the moral and material factors of the State: "The inhabitants having abundant means of subsistence exceed in consequence the ordinary stature, and are distinguished by their proud bearing... It is accordingly affirmed that famine has never visited India, and that there has never been a great scarcity in the supply of nourishing food." It is worthy of note that in India the state itself never became a theocracy in the proper sense of the word. First, the ruler was never regarded as the head of religion. Secondly, the primary object of the state was not spiritual salvation, but social well-being. Thirdly, law, mingled as it was with religion and morality, was the chief source of the authority of the state. Lastly, the political status of individuals was independent of their religious beliefs and convictions. "The great drawback of the state in Ancient India was that the rights of man as man were not fully recognised. Individuals had rights and duties not as component parts of the body politic but as members of estates or classes in society." It is interesting to note that in the Mahabharata era, almost all the Indian nations possessed popular institutions of some type or other. At the time of the rise of Buddhism, the republican or oligarchical system of government prevailed in most tribes. Even at the date of Alexander's invasion, the nations of the Punjab lived under democratic institutions. Sometimes the state was ruled by a President at the head of an assembly of elders. But the suzerain (Chakravarti, Samrat, Sarbabhauma) idea gradually gained in importance, though the system of government which supplanted the republics was a limited monarchy. The Shastras, the cus-

toms of the country, the influence of learned Brahmans as a class, the natural guardians of society, and of the Councils of Ministers were the various checks on the authority of the monarch. "The results of good government were to be seen in the happiness and prosperity of the people, the growth of literature, arts and sciences, and the development of a high order of civilisation." The Empire of Asoka, according to Mr. V. A. Smith, was far more extensive than the British Empire of to-day, excluding Burmah. In Vedic times, kingship often seems to have been elective. Kings were also sometimes deposed by the people. The formal offer by the people of the sovereignty to the king was for a long time held essential. Gradually there grew up the theory of the divine origin of kingship. But there is no doubt that at bottom the relations between the ruler and the ruled were contractual. 'The conception of the king as the servant of the state was one of the basic principles of political thought in Ancient India.' The Sukraniti says : "(Brahma) created the king to be the servant of his subjects, and he is remunerated by a share of the produce. He assumes the character (of king) only for protecting (his subject)." Again, "if the king is an enemy of virtue, morality, and power, and is unrighteous in conduct, the people should expel him as a destroyer of the state." The idea of an autocratic (svatantra) ruler was not very congenial to the Hindu mind. The king in India was never regarded as being above the law. At no time was the royal power, in theory at least, quite absolute. The Mahabharata derives the word 'Rajan' from 'ranj', to please. Among the kingly duties, as enumerated in the great epic, are (1) to please the people, (2) to protect them and (3) always to seek their welfare. There were two kinds of Assembly—the Samiti and the Sabha. The popular assembly was a regular institution in the early years of the Buddhistic age. The rule of the majority was not unknown, and it is probable that the decisions of the majority prevailed. The

Mantri-Parishat or the Council of Ministers was the chief administrative authority in the kingdom. It possessed immense powers, and enjoyed a great deal of independence. In exceptional cases, it had even the power to elect the king. "In point of numbers," says Megasthenes, "it is a small class, but it is distinguished by superior wisdom and justice." According to the *Nitivakyamrita*, "unanimity of opinion being difficult to obtain, the number (of ministers) should be uneven." "Though such ministers controlled the destinies of large kingdoms and sometimes extensive empires, they, as a rule, led very simple lives, and were renowned for their honesty, integrity, and nobility of character." "The Parishats of olden days may, in a sense, be called legislative assemblies. Although their main business was to interpret—not to enact—laws, yet in performing this duty they, not unoften, changed the laws so as to bring them into greater harmony with the altered circumstances of changed times. The rules of conduct were not inflexible in ancient times, and the Parishats, while maintaining the infallibility of the Vedas and the Smritis, considerably modified the spirit of the laws. The text-book writers, in compiling the old laws of the country, greatly helped the process of change, and in later times, the commentators also contributed to the same result." The administration of justice bore several points of resemblance to the system now prevalent in civilised countries. The king, together with the Chief-Justice (*Pradvivaka*) and three or four other judges (*dharmaikah*), formed the highest court of justice. It was, however, the Chief Justice, who in reality presided over the King's court even when the king was present, had two sorts of jurisdiction, original and appellate. Next in importance to the King's court were the district courts, and below them were the village courts, composed of the headman and the elders of the village. There was a regular mode of appeal from the decisions of the inferior courts to the superior courts. Trials were always held in public.

The Sukraniti says: "Neither the king nor the members of the Judicial Assembly should ever try cases in private." The prevalence of litigation in modern India is sometimes referred to as a sign of its falling off from a past Golden Age. But it appears that the complaint is as old as Narada himself, for he says: "When mortals were bent on doing their duty, and were habitually veracious, there existed neither lawsuits, nor hatred, nor selfishness. The practice of duty having died out among mankind, lawsuits have been introduced." There were professional lawyers (pratinidhi). The means of arriving at truth at the disposal of judges were four, namely, direct perception (pratyaksha), reasoning (yukti), inference (anumana), and analogy (upamana). There were trials by ordeal, which were resorted to when the evidence failed to elicit the truth. Hieun Tsang emphatically states that in the investigation of criminal cases the rod or the staff was never used. "The idea of equality before the law was not fully developed in Ancient India. A modified form of privilege ran through the whole system of Hindu jurisprudence. The law was not the same for all, but depended upon the status of the person concerned, ...the Brahmans, as a rule, enjoyed immunity from the more degrading kinds of punishment..." "From the records preserved in Indian literature as well as from the account left by foreign travellers, it seems quite clear that the administration of justice was very efficient in ancient India. This must have been the result of three factors, namely, the uprightness of the judges, the efficiency of the Police, and the general honesty and probity of the people." Vishnu gives the following advice to a conqueror: "Having conquered the country of his foe, let him not abolish (or disregard) the laws of that country... A king having conquered the capital of his foe, should invest there a prince of the royal race of that country with the royal dignity. Let him not extirpate the royal race..." Chanakya says: "The King should adopt the manners, customs, dress, and language of the conquered people ;

and show respect to their national, religious, and social ceremonies and festivals." While the rulers of the different parts of India fought with one another for supremacy, the country remained constantly exposed to the danger of foreign invasions. The history of these invasions shows us in a clear light the weak points of the political system of ancient India... neither martial spirit nor their efficient military organisation was of any avail for the preservation of their national independence, for the political condition of the country was eminently favourable to Alexander's designs. The Punjab was then divided into a number of separate States, and instead of presenting a united front to the invader, the states, in most instances, fought him singly, with the result that they were overcome with comparative ease... As Mr. McCrindle rightly remarks, "if Alexander had found India united in arms to withstand his aggression, the star of his good fortune would have culminated with his passage of the Indus...." The political condition of India which made possible the foundation of the Mahomedan empire is thus described by Stanley Lane-Poole: "The country was split up into numerous kingdoms, many of which were at feud with one another... Internal division has proved the undoing of India again and again, and has sapped the power of mere numbers which alone could enable the men of the warm plains to stand against the hardy mountain tribes."

POLITICUS.

MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONS IN ANCIENT INDIA

A good deal of misconception seems to exist in the minds not only of our English rulers, but also of a majority of our educated countrymen, with regard to the form of government that obtained in Ancient India. By Ancient India, of course, I mean the India that existed long before the Mahomedans came to this country and established their supremacy. It was an India in which the *regime* was Hindu, the civilization was essentially Hindu, and the subjects also were mostly Hindus.* Any account, therefore, of the form of government that obtained in Ancient India, must needs be drawn mainly from ancient Sanskrit works, and chiefly from the old Epics, the Puranas and the Samhitas.

It may be argued that the description of any form of government, to be found in an Epic poem, would ordinarily savour of an ideal character, and would not necessarily prove its actual existence, except, of course, in the imagination of the poet. There would undoubtedly be some force in this argument, but for the fact that the poet's imagination though it might soar high up in the heavens and become more and more etherealized in its upward flight, draws its materials from the earth, and is earthly in character. The picture, therefore, that is present before the poet's mental eye, is drawn and shaped from what appeals most to his fancy in his immediate surroundings. It may not be a faithful representa-

* The term "Hindus" includes also those among the people who professed the Buddhist faith. It does not appear that Buddhism modified to any appreciable extent, the old political institutions of the country and the personal laws of the people.

tion of the state of things as actually exists, but, nevertheless, it gives us a pretty good idea of what those things are like, from which the poet draws his materials.

As regards the Samhitas, it may be said that though some of the ancient lawgivers mixed up in their codification of the laws of the country much that can be described as foreign matter, viz., cosmogony and social and political ethics, yet unlike the poets they had to keep an eye more to the realities of life than to its possibilities, as it was primarily their business to help the king in the administration of justice and the enforcement of the laws of the country. The Samhitas, therefore, can be relied upon to a far greater extent than the epics for furnishing us with a picture of the state of society and of government, as it existed at the time when they were composed.

With these few observations, I will now proceed to briefly discuss the causes that have contributed to the existence of the present misconception with regard to the form of government that obtained in Ancient India. The first cause is the long period that intervenes between Ancient and Modern India, which entirely shuts out the former from one's ordinary range of vision. Ancient India lies deeply buried, as it were, in the darkness of the Past, and it will never stand revealed to anybody, unless he cares to plunge into the darkness and make a search for it, with the help of such light as is available in the pages of old Sanskrit works, and contemporaneous accounts. The task is laborious and tiresome to a degree, and is probably more difficult than that of the intrepid painter who has made up his mind to paint the landscape of the bottom of the sea in all its true colours, by means of a contrivance which enables him to use his palette and brush below the waters. The second cause is that Mediaeval India, which stands between Ancient and Modern India, was essentially a Mahomedan India which gradually obliterated most of the distinguishing landmarks.

of Ancient India, and imposed a form of government on the people, which the Hindu system had to adapt itself as best it could. The result of this adaptation was a transformation of the Hindu system, to a very large extent, so that in its transformed shape, it was more closely allied to the Mahomedan system than to the ancient system of the Hindus. The third cause is that our early English rulers derived their knowledge of the people from the civilization that they had directly come into contact with, and it is the record of these their early impressions that is still helping our present rulers to form an estimate as to the capacity of the Indian people for self-government. No wonder, therefore, that even such an enlightened statesman as Lord Morley, should have authoritatively declared from his place in the House of Commons that the Indians are not yet fit for the boon of self-government and that even the educated section of the people cannot carry on the government of the country "even for a week!"

It is admitted on all hands, that the form of Government in India under Mahomedan rule was absolute Monarchy. Popular representation was, of course, out of the question; but it cannot be denied that during this period, local Self-government in the shape of Village Communities or Panchayets, played no unimportant part. We will presently show that the village community, or the latter-day panchayet system, was only a remnant of the system of government that obtained in ancient India. The establishment of English Law Courts in the country, and the power which was conferred on District Officers to meddle with, control and transform everything within their jurisdictions, combined to root out a system which had its birth in hoary antiquity, and managed to survive the various changes that were introduced by the Mahomedan rulers, from time to time.

I will not detain my readers with any account of the system of village communities, with which all stu-

dents of Indian history are pretty well familiar. But I will at once proceed to describe how it worked in Ancient India, and for this purpose, it is necessary for us to seek the help of the Samhitas.

Rai Bahadur Pandit Rajendrachandra Sastri, M.A., of Calcutta, contributed, some time ago, to the *Buddhist Text Society's Journal*, a very interesting paper on "Municipal Institutions in Ancient India," in which he clearly demonstrates that municipal institutions are not an exotic growth in India, but that "they are an indigenous product which only requires fit soil to grow up and flourish." I cannot do better than describe the ancient municipal institutions in the words of the learned Pandit himself :—

"The chapter in all Smṛiti compilations, known as Vyavaharadhaya, or the chapter on the administration of Justice, has a section, dealing with संवित् व्यतिक्रमः *Sambit-Vyatikrama* or the non-performance of an agreement or the violation of a prescribed course of conduct, which was regarded as one of eighteen Vivadapadas or causes for legal action. Now the संवित् *Sambit* or agreement which the section contemplates, is of two kinds, viz., *Rajakrita* राजकृत and *Samuhakrita* समूहकृत, in other words, that laid down by the king, and that by the different public bodies..... The body of learned men created by the king was known as *Rajakrita Samudaya* (or the body created by the king) and the prescribed course of duty which this body had to perform, was known as the *Rajakrita Sambit* राजकृत संवित्. Although the royal edict, which created the body, simply enjoined its members to practise their moral and religious duties [*svadharmah palyatam*, do you perform the acts enjoined by your religion], they had nevertheless to do, at times, things of a secular and political nature. Their main duties consisted, of course, in assisting towns-people in the discharge of their daily, occasional and optional religious duties, in officiating in ceremonies undertaken with a view to avert providential visitations and ensuring public peace and prosperity, and in giving authoritative decisions on doubtful points presumably connected with religion * But they had also to perform duties, different from

- * Vrihaspati as quoted in the Viramitrodaya :—

नित्यं नैमित्तिकं कान्यं शान्तिकं-पौष्टिकन्तथा ।

पौराणां कर्म कुर्युस्ते सन्दिग्धे निर्णयं तथा ॥

these, which they may have agreed to do at the time of their appointment, or which the king might require them to do in addition to their ordinary duties, provided always that they were not inconsistent with their main duties as specified above. These other duties consisted in protecting grazing grounds and watercourses, in looking after temples and other places of worship, and in performing acts of a similar nature..... As they were created by the king, the people had no voice in their appointment or dismissal. The king had, however, to see that they consisted wholly of learned Brahmins, and that the secular duties entrusted to them in no way interfered with an efficient discharge by them of their religious and moral obligations."

Such then were the duties of the bodies of learned men created by the king. But there were also bodies or *samudayas*, elected by the people, and their nature, constitution and functions were as follows :

"According to Vrihaspati and Yajnavalkya, * villages, townships, guilds of merchants and mechanics, communities of Brahmins and heretics and other bodies, should, when expecting common danger or when inspired by a desire to properly discharge their secular and religious duties, or those relating to their trade or profession, in the case of mercantile or other guilds enter into an agreement among themselves for the protection of their common interest and the proper performance of their duties. The duties, specified under their agreements which these bodies were required to execute in writing, (*yavaitalikhitam patre, dharma sa samayakriya*) and which thereby acquired a moral and legal sanction, were the repair of public halls, *prapas* (places where drinking water is supplied to travellers, wells, cisterns, etc.), temples, tanks and gardens; the performance of the purificatory rites for the poor and the destitute, and arrangements for the cremations of dead paupers, distribution of gifts among the people desirous of performing religious acts, and supporting people in time of famine and distress. † It is these duties which

* ग्रामश्रेणीगणानाञ्च संकेतः समयक्रिया ।

वाधाकाले तु सा कार्या धर्मकार्यं तथैवच ॥

चारचौरभये वाधाः सर्वसाधारणः स्मृताः ।

तथोपग्रमनं कार्यं सर्वं नैकेन केनचित् ॥ *Viramitrodaya*

† सभाग्रामपादिवरगृह-तडागारासमृद्धाकृतिः ।

तथानाथदरिद्राणां संस्कारो यजनक्रिया ।

we know as *समुहकृत-संविद्* or the course of conduct or duty established by the public bodies. The *samuhās* were free to take up other duties also, provided that they were not inconsistent with, or antagonistic to their main duties."

"The next step, after the execution of the agreement, was to appoint executive officers (*karyachintaka*) for the discharge of the duties specified in the agreement.

"The numbers of these officers varied, according to Vrihaspati, from two to five. * And having regard to the area of an ordinary Indian town or village, the number cannot be said to have been inadequate for the management of its affairs. In the case of big towns, the number of executive officers, or commissioners as we might call them, appointed by the people, added to the number appointed by the king, certainly sufficed for their requirements... These commissioners were responsible only to their electors, who could punish them in case of misconduct with fine, dismissal and (even) banishment from the area over which they held sway. In such cases, they had simply to notify their decision to the king, who accepted it as a matter of course. The texts of *Katyayana* and *Vrihaspati* are explicit on this point. Says *Katyayana* :—

साहस्यी भेदकारी च गणद्रव्यविनाशकः

उच्छेद्याः सर्व एवेते विख्यापयते नृपे भगुः ।

"That is to say, as is said by *Vrihaspati*, he who (among the *mukhyas* or headmen) is guilty of a serious criminal offence, who habitually creates disunion (among his colleagues) and who destroys public property—all of them should be removed, and the removal notified to the king."

The text of *Vrihaspati*, when translated, runs as follows :—

"Headmen (commissioners) residing in towns and forts, and managing the affairs of *Pugas* (mercantile and other guilds), *Srenis* (bodies of men, following the same trade or profession) and *Ganas* (communities of *Brahmanas* or of other people distinct from the *Srenis*) should punish wrong-doers by administering rebuke or censure, as well as with social ostracism and banish-

* कुलायननिरोधश्च कार्यमस्त्राभिरंशतः ।

यो वैतस्त्रिखितं पत्रे धर्म्या सा समयक्रिया ॥

Quoted in *Viramitrodaya* and *Vivadarātnakara*.

दौ-त्रयः पञ्च वा कार्याः समूहकृतवादिनः ।

कर्तव्यं वचनं तेषां ग्रामश्रेणिगणादिभिः ॥

ment. And the favour or disfavour, thus meted out by them (to the people), when in accordance with the precepts of religion and morality, should be accepted by the king ; for general approval had already been accorded to whatever these might do (in the ordinary course of their duties)." *

The above interpretation is in accordance with Vivadaratnakara which takes the passage generally as declaring the power of public bodies, duly constituted, to punish wrong-doers living within the limits of their jurisdiction, and quotes a passage from Vrihaspati to say that in cases of difference between the *Mukhyas* and the *Samuhas*, the king should interfere and compel each party to perform its respective duties.† But the *Viramitrodaya* takes the passage as referring to the punishment, in case of wrong-doing, of *Mukhyas* (commissioners) by the *Samuhas* (public bodies). ‡

The learned Pandit, above referred to, draws from the above account the following just conclusions :

"It is, therefore, clear that Municipalities and other public bodies (in ancient India) enjoyed large powers within their respective limits ; that their duties were similar to, and in some respects, much more arduous and comprehensive than those now performed by similar institutions under British rule ; that they enjoyed considerable civil and criminal jurisdiction within their limits ; that they could punish their commissioners in case of misconduct, even with banishment from their area, and that the government had to endorse their decisions, except when they were irregularly arrived at."

* पूगश्रेणिगणाध्याताः पूरदुर्गनिवासिनः ।
वागधिगद्वल्परित्यागं प्रकुशुः पापकारिणाम् ॥
तैः कृतं यत् स्वधर्मेण नियद्धानुग्रहं नृणाम् ।
तद्वाज्ञा अनुमन्तव्यं निसृष्टार्था हि ते स्मृताः ॥

† सुखैः सह समूहानां विस्वादो यदा भवेत् ।
तदा विचारयेद्वाजा स्वधर्मे स्थापयेच्च तान् ॥

‡ पूर्वोक्तकाव्यायनवचनेन समूहस्यैव सुखदण्डणेशधिकारस्य प्रतिपादितत्वात्, पूगश्रेणिगणाध्याताः पूरदुर्गनिवासिनः.....इत्यादि वृहस्पतिनाथभिनानाह ।—*Viramitrodaya*, Jivananda Vidyasagar's Edition, p. 429.

It will thus be seen that the principles of Local Self-government were fully understood and acted upon by the ancient Hindus. What seems to have made Local Self-government eminently successful in Ancient India was its entire freedom from the control and interference of the king, except on rare occasions, and the very large powers which the public bodies enjoyed. The reason why Local Self-Government has not been able to make any considerable headway under British rule, and has failed to make its advantages felt and appreciated by the people, is nothing more or less than that the Municipalities and the District and Local Boards are too much under official control, and are viewed by the people more with awe and suspicion, than with love and trust. They look upon these institutions as so many departments of the Government itself, and, therefore, do not feel any ardour or enthusiasm for them, as they otherwise would have done, if the institutions had belonged to them, and been completely under their control. Ancient India furnishes an admirable object lesson in this respect to modern India, which would do well to imitate the example of the former. The institutions which constitute modern Local Self-government in India are half-hearted measures, and like all such measures, have proved failures.

ABINAS CHANDRA DAS.

ANCIENT VILLAGE GOVERNMENT IN SOUTHERN INDIA

In an article on "Village Government in Southern India" contributed to the *Modern Review* for March, 1914, Sir C. Sankaran Nair says :—

"Representative government is so constantly alleged to be abhorrent to the spirit of the East that I shall quote in extenso the rules for election for one of these [village] assemblies from the report of the archaeological superintendent for 1904-1905, pp. 131-145. These rules are said to have been promulgated in A. D. 918-919 and 920-921."

The extracts he made are printed below :—

(Lines 1-2) Hail! Prosperity! On the sixteenth day of the fourteenth year of King Parakesarivarman who conquered Madurai (i. e., Madura)—whereas a royal letter of His Majesty, Our Lord, the glorious Viranarayana, the illustrious Parantaka Deva, the prosperous Parakesarivarman, was received and was shown to us, we, the (members of the) assembly of Uttarameru Catur-Vedimangalan in its own sub-division of Kaliyurkottam, Karanjai Kondaya—Kramavitta—bhattan alias Somasiperuman of Srivanganagar in Purangarambhai—Nadu (a district) of the Cola country, sitting (with us) and convening the committee in accordance with the (royal) command, made a settlement, as follows according to (the terms of) the royal letter for choosing one every year from this year forward (members for) the "annual committee," "Garden Committee" and "Tank Committee." (Lines 2-31). There shall be thirty wards.

2. In (these) wards, those that live in each ward shall assemble and shall choose for 'pot-tickets' (kudavolai) (any one possessing the following qualifications.)

(a) "He must own more than a quarter (veli) of tax-paying land.

(b) He must live in a house built on his own site.

(c) His age must be below 70 and above 35.

(d) He must know the Mantrabrahmana (i.e.,) he must know it by teaching (others).

3. Even if one owns one-eighth veli of land, (he shall have) his name written on the pot-ticket to be put into the (pot), in case he has learnt one Veda and one of the four bhasyas by explaining (to others).

4. Among those (possessing the fore-going qualifications) (i) only such as are well conversant with business and are virtuous shall be taken and (ii) one who possesses honest earnings, whose mind is pure and who has not been on (any of) the committees for the last three years shall also be chosen.

(Lines 4-6) One who has been on any of the committees but has not submitted his accounts and all his relations specified below shall not have (their names) written on the pot-tickets and put into the pot.

1. The sons of the younger and elder sisters of his mother.
2. The sons of his paternal aunt and maternal uncle.
3. The uterine brother of his mother.

4. The uterine brother of his father.
5. His uterine brother.
6. His father-in-law.
7. The uterine brother of his wife.
8. The husband of his uterine sister.
9. The sons of his uterine sister.
10. The son-in-law who has married his daughter.
11. His father.
12. His son.

(Lines 6—9) A. "One against whom incest (Agamyagaman) or the first four of the five great sins are recorded; and

B. "All his relations above specified shall not have (their names) written on the pot-tickets and put into (the pot).

C. "One who has been outcast for association (with low people) shall not, until he performs the expiatory ceremonies, have (his name) chosen for the pot-ticket.

D. "One who is foolhardy.....shall not have (his name) written on the pot-ticket to be put into (the pot).

E. "One who has stolen the property of others shall not have (his name) written on the pot-ticket to be put into (the pot).

F. "One who has taken forbidden dishes of any kind and who has become pure by performing the ghee expiation shall not to the end of his life have (his name) written on the pot-ticket to be put into (the pot) for the committees.

G. "One who has committed...sins and has become pure by performing expiatory ceremonies;

H. "One who having been a village pest has become pure by performing expiatory ceremonies;

I. "One who is guilty of incest and has become pure by performing expiatory ceremonies; all those specified shall not, to the end of their lives, have (their names) written on the pot-ticket to be put into (the pot) for (any of the) committees."

(Lines 9-11). "Excluding these thus specified, names shall be written for 'pot-tickets' in the thirty wards each of the wards in these twelve streets (of Uttaramallur) shall prepare a separate covering ticket for (each of the) thirty wards handled separately. (These tickets?) shall be put into a pot. When the pot-tickets have to be drawn, a full meeting of the great assembly including the young and old (members), shall be convened. All the temple priests (nambimai), who happen to be in the village on the day, shall without any exception whatever, be caused to be seated in the inner hall, (where) the great assembly (meet). In the midst of the temple priests, one of them who happens to be the eldest, shall stand up and lift that pot, looking upwards so as to be seen by all people. One ward (i.e., the packet representing it) shall be taken out by any young boy standing close, who does not know what is inside, and shall be transferred to another (empty) pot and shaken. From this pot one ticket shall be drawn (by the young boy) and made over to the arbitrator (Madhyastha). While taking charge of the ticket thus given (to him) the arbitrator shall receive it on the palm of his hand with

the five fingers open. He shall read out (the name on) the ticket thus received. The ticket read by him shall (also) be read out by all the priests present in the hall. The names thus read out shall be put down (and accepted). Similarly one man shall be chosen for (each of) the thirty wards."

(Lines 11-13). "Of the thirty men thus chosen, those who had (previously) been on the 'garden committee' and on the 'tank committee', those who are advanced in learning, and those who are advanced in age, shall be chosen for the annual committee; of the rest, twelve shall be taken for the 'garden committee' and the remaining six shall form the 'tank committee'. These last two committees shall be chosen by the Karai. The great men of these three committees thus (chosen) for them shall hold office for full three hundred and sixty days and then retire. When one who is on the committees is found guilty of (any) offence, he shall be removed (at once). For appointing the committees after these have retired, the members of the 'committee for supervision of justice' in the twelve streets (of Uttaramallur) shall convene an assembly (kuri) with the help of the arbitrator. The committees shall be appointed by drawing pot-tickets according to this order of settlement."

(Lines 13-16) "For the 'Pancavara committee' and the 'gold committee' names shall be written for pot-tickets in the thirty wards, thirty (packets with) covering tickets shall be deposited (in a pot) and thirty pot-tickets shall be drawn (as previously described). From (these) thirty tickets twelve men shall be selected. Six out of twelve (thus) chosen shall form the 'gold committee' and the (remaining) six the 'pancavara committee'. When drawing pot-tickets for these two committees next year the wards which have been already represented (during the year in question) on these committees shall be excluded and the selection made from the remaining wards by drawing the kari. One who has ridden on an ass and one who has committed forgery shall not have (his name) written on the pot-ticket to be put (into the pot).

"Any arbitrator who possesses honest earnings shall write the accounts (of the village). No accountant shall be appointed to that office again before he submits his accounts (for the period during which he was in office) to the great men of the big committee and (is declared) to have been honest. The accounts which one has been writing he shall submit himself, and no other accountant shall be chosen to close his accounts." (Line 16) "Thus from this year onwards, as long as the Moon and Sun endure, committees shall always be appointed by 'pot-tickets' alone. To this effect was the royal letter received and shown (to us), graciously issued by the Lord of Gods, the emperor, one who is fond of learned men, the wrestler with elephants, the crest jewel of heroes, whose acts (i.e., gifts) (resembles those of the) celestial tree, the glorious Parakesarivarman."

(Lines 16-17) "At the royal command Karanjai Kondaya-

kramavittabhattan alias Somaciperuman of Srivanganagar in Purangarambbai Nadu (a district of the Cola Country) sat with (us) and thus caused (this settlement) to be made."

(Lines 17-18) We, the (members of the) assembly of Uttarameru-Chaturvedimangalam, made (this) settlement for the prosperity of our village in order that wicked men may perish and the rest may prosper.

At the order of the great men sitting in the assembly I, the arbitrator Kadadipottan Sivakkuri-Rajamalla-mangalapriyan thus wrote the settlement.

Sir C. Sankaran Nair concludes his article with the remarks :—

"It is interesting to observe that ladies were eligible for election and a lady was a member of a committee of justice. (Report for 1910, section 35, p. 98.) Other village assemblies appear to have consisted of cultivators and merchants. The archaeological superintendent surmises that the same rules applied to them, except knowledge of the Vedas. (Report for 1912-1913, p. 98.)

*Woman
Suffrage*

"After this who can say that representative institutions and self-government are a foreign importation?"

RACE SUPERIORITY

One of the objections raised against Home Rule is that Indians belong to an inferior race. Britishers have superior morals which Indians cannot approach. We think it is always risky to indulge either in wholesale condemnation or in wholesale eulogy of a people, nor do we believe that such sweeping statements can ever be wholly or generally true. Inferior and superior specimens of humanity can be found both in Great Britain and India. It is easy to find authors finding fault with the British people, as it is easy to quote instances of the vilification of Indians. For instance, Lecky writes :—

"A disinterested love of truth can hardly co-exist with a strong political spirit. In all countries where the habits of thought have been mainly formed by political life, we may discover a disposition to make expediency the test of truth, to close the eyes and turn away the mind from any arguments that tend toward a radical change. * *—(*History of European Morals*).

It should be remembered that the British nation have been reared on politics.

Mr. Kelly, a well-known American writer, says :—

"European diplomacy is neither more nor less than lying on a large scale, and any less immoral system would be denounced as unpractical by the moral sense of European nations. We can not but ask ourselves why individuals should respect morality with one another when they hold it up to scorn in their relations with neighbouring states?"—Page 146 of Kelly's *Government or Human Evolution*.

If we were disposed to attach too much importance to pronouncements like the above, we should have to say that truthfulness was at a discount in Europe. But we should not believe that truthful persons are rarer in Europe than in other parts of the world. Nor do we believe that the character of a people is unchangeable. What may be true of it in one age may not be true in another. It is certainly not correct to say that every Britisher excels every Indian in a greater regard for truth notwithstanding what Lord Curzon and others of his mode of thinking might say to the contrary.

One has to read Max Muller's lecture on the truthful character of the Hindus to be convinced of the fact that they are not inferior in this respect to any other people on the face of the earth.

It is said that perjury in law courts shows that Indians do not possess any regard for truth. But exactly the same sort of thing has been said of British lawcourts and British witnesses by British judges and others. We have room here for only one such opinion. His Honour Judge Edge, of the Clerkenwell county court, said in a judgment delivered on the 15th December 1911 :—

"The increase of perjury in the country courts is so alarming that public attention ought to be directed to it. It is a pressing

demand. I am saying it as a retiring judge, being in the Bench for 23 years, that it is almost impossible to do justice between the parties owing to the prevalence of false swearing. *It is really shocking.* It has been a matter which has placed a very great anxiety upon judges who have to try cases and endeavour to do what is right and just between the parties. False swearing is increasing in a way that I think the legislature ought to pay attention to at once. I do not think any one would oppose that greater powers should be placed in the hands of judges for checking perjury."

Nor can it be said that Britishers are exemplary in private morals. For the birth-rate of illegitimate children in their country is high. The Report of a Royal Commission published in March, 1916, says that the number of persons in their country who have been infected with venereal diseases cannot fall below ten per cent. of the whole population in the large cities. Our object in saying these things and what follows is not to claim moral superiority for our own people, but only to show that if Great Britain were a dependent country its foreign rulers could have found excuses for excluding its people from the enjoyment of political power.

Drunkenness prevails in England to a degree which fortunately is unknown in India. But we do not know how long this superiority of *British* India will last.

The cases of Crawford, Larpent and some others have only to be cited to show that in matters of official corruption there are black sheep amongst whites also. The practice of taking "dalis" by white officials is well-known. In England itself municipal corruption and the offering and acceptance of bribes during elections are not negligible evils. During the Boer war there were scandals in connection with the supply of war materials tarnishing the names of prominent men.

Sir Ch. Dilke wrote, quoting instances within his personal observation, in his *Greater Britain*, regarding the "singularly strong disposition towards cruelty" of his people, "wherever they have a weak enemy to meet." "It is not only in war-time that our cruelty comes out; it is often seen in trifles dur-

ing peace." We need not quote the whole passage. It may be read in the fifth edition of his "Greater Britain" (1870), pp. 445-447. Yet it is not difficult to find Englishmen who are chivalrous towards weak races. Sir Charles also quotes conversation and historical examples which made him "remember our descent from Scandinavian Sea-king robbers." Yet he would be a biased man who would conclude from a passage like the one referred to here that every Englishman was a potential robber. Unfortunately, however, in the case of Indians, it is exactly from particular instances like these that an indictment is drawn up against the whole population.

General Booth branded large portions of the land of his birth and living as "Darkest England." He knew that the amount of immorality which prevailed in his country was simply appalling. He held that debauchery, drunkenness—aye, every sort of crime and vice, grew and thrived luxuriantly in the soil of Christian England and Scotland. We do not know whether his enthusiasm led him unconsciously to draw too dark a picture.

Sir Thomas Munro, in his evidence before the Parliamentary Committee appointed to enquire into Indian affairs, gave the following characteristic reply when asked about civilizing the people of India :—

"I do not understand what is meant by the civilization of the Hindus ; * * * But if a good system of agriculture, unrivalled manufacturing skill, a capacity to produce whatever can contribute to convenience or luxury ; schools established in every village for teaching reading, writing and arithmetic ; the general practice of hospitality and charity amongst each other ; and above all, a treatment of the female sex full of confidence, respect and delicacy, are among the signs which denote a civilised people, then the Hindus are not inferior to the nations of Europe and if civilisation is to become an article of trade between the two countries, I am convinced that this country (England) will gain by the import cargo."

The above holds true to a great extent even to-day as it did a century ago when uttered by Sir Thomas Munro.

We have said nothing regarding the intellectual

capacity of Indians, for it is too late in the day to deny its existence now. Nor have we dwelt on the fighting capacity of the races inhabiting India. As for the administrative and executive ability of Indians, it would be idle to contend that men whose ancestors commanded armies and governed provinces and whose brethren still show governing capacity in the Indian States, are hopelessly incompetent.

CIVIC ELEMENTS IN INDIAN LIFE

The essential condition for the development of a strong civic spirit lies in the maintenance of the communal life and consciousness, and this condition is fulfilled nowhere else in the world as it is in oriental countries. This is to a certain extent the result of climate. Life, in the clear air and under the cloudless skies of India, is necessarily passed much in the open air. That the street is a kind of club, the very architecture, with its verandah and stone couches, bears mute witness. The family-homes stand ranged behind the great open-air *salon*,* like a row of convent-cells, for the stricter members of the choir. Sometimes there are added evidences of the larger social grouping visible to the eye. Bhubaneswar has its great tree in the midst of the parting of three roads, and at any hour one may see there knots of talkers of one sort or another, seated at ease beneath it.† Conjeeveram is like a city out of the old Greek or Assyrian world, so wide is the roadway that leads to the temple-entrance, and so splendid the arch that spans it just before, eloquent, both of

* *Salon*—French for drawing-room, *boithak-khana*.

† This is the case with almost all rural towns and villages.

communal worship and rejoicing. Nor are women in India altogether without their civic centres and gathering-places, though these are necessarily concerned chiefly with the bathing-ghat, the temple and the well.

Such meetings, however, of the inhabitants of a single street, or the members of either sex, amongst themselves, are not in strictness reunions of the highest civic order. They serve indeed to keep before the mind of each member of the community that social unit which transcends the family. But that unit is still simplified by adhesion to a single religious doctrine or a single body of custom. It is thus communal or parochial,* rather than civic. It is after all, intellectually speaking, but as an assembly within the village. Now a city is made up of men and families from a thousand villages, and they are by no means of one faith alone, or even of one nationality. How complex is the typical city, we may be better able to judge, if we recall for a moment some of its more primitive examples. They stand always, as Kropotkin points out, at the crossings of the great highways. To see this, we have only to look at Benares, at Allahabad, at Babylon. To this day, all the railroads in India centre at Delhi.

The ideal city, then, is the meeting-place of shepherd and peasant, of merchant and artificer, of priest and pilgrim, of court and camp. It is the centre towards which converge streams that rise in all the quarters of the globe. It is a marketplace and an exchange, a focus of wealth and industry, a hall of international council, and the quadrangle of a world-university. Babylon,—set on the great river that flows north and south, midway between Persepolis and Thebes, with her highways running to Damascus and Baalbek, to Arabia, and even to distant China,—forms a supreme example of the civic complexity. But Taxila must once have curious-

* How instructive is the comparison between the English word *parish* and the Bengali *para* !

ly resembled her, and ancient Thaneswar, and glorious Pataliputra.

The fractional unit, then, is not the civic unity. The "quarter" is not the city. Yet it is, as we know it in India, a marvellously enduring fragment of an old-time unity, which carries with it, if we have eyes to read, a code of civic honour and a habit of civic fraternity. The village is a larger family, and a smaller city, and nothing can be more significant than the forms which its communal activity takes in India. The portion of the field that belonged to the Brahman was tilled for him. The widow's digging was done by her neighbours. The school-master and his wife were maintained by gifts. It is learning, we note, and the spiritual power, for whose maintenance the community concentrates its energy. To this day, there is no village in India, however poor, that will ask a stranger to visit it, in the capacity of teacher or thinker, without paying every expense of conveyance to and fro, in addition to the outlay incidental to the presence of a visitor. We have here the evidence of a vast civic culture, deeply-rooted in historic habits.

The same truth is impressed upon us in another way, by the ease with which Indian towns exert themselves to show civic hospitality. Here we have substantial earnest of the readiness to enter into larger organisation. There is no Hindu township that would present an address of welcome to a distinguished guest without the inclusion of Mohammedan names. Similarly, the Mohammedan district will make no representative deputation unless the Hindu residents of good standing are also to be found upon it. India is supposed to be sectarian, but no one ever heard of the members of one sect trying to exclude those of another from collective action! In such mutual courtesy and recognition, we have the largest possible basis for civic self-realisation of the highest order. It is by the study and understanding of our own cities, and their institutions, it must be remembered, that

we shall be able to develop and build up our civic sense.

It has been said that the whole demand of citizenship lies in the claim that all the work of the city should be done by the people of the city. This is, as I cannot help thinking, but a defective summary of the duties of citizens. Surely they ought to rejoice together! Unless they meet now and then, indeed, with conscious thought of the one bond that securely unites them, amidst all their apparent diversities, the very spirit of citizenship will be likely to depart altogether, and leave them sundered. And this thought of kinship must be expressed in festivity. It has ever been in the history of man, that the realising of social unity found expression in joy.

This is the feeling that speaks in every triumphal arch that ends a village-road, and crowns a bathing-ghat, on the banks of the Ganges. This is the feeling that our fathers knew, when they instituted the practice of procession. Over and over again, in the Rig-Veda, the earth is referred to as "the sacrifice" round which the path of light makes a priestly circle, in the course of the year. It is one of the most beautiful and vigorous of similes. That of Auguste Comte which may be freely translated "The Earth itself is but the largest image, and space about it the infinite altar," sounds almost like an echo of the Vedic metaphor. But it reminds us of beautiful processions of the images which are so characteristic a feature of life in Indian towns. As the light encircles the earth, so verily do these ceremonial pilgrimages girdle our boroughs and villages, nay, it is not only the worshipper of Saraswati or the commemorator of Mohurram, who makes the circumambulation of the communal home. The whole Indian idea of enjoyment is communal, and even at a marriage, processions form the typical delight.

Let us not forget that at the heart of the circle lies the sacred object. Already there are rising amongst us, hereafter to be multiplied in number and deepened

in significance, those other processions, symbolic of the idea of city and nationality. Already it is no uncommon thing to see the streets and lanes of a Hindu town filled with its singing boys who, carrying banners and instruments, are chanting prayers to no god or goddess, but intoning the sacred address to the Motherland "Bande Mataram". Let us all remember as we watch them, that the city about which they march is the symbol of the nationality, that in her is the throne of the Mother Herself. The future will see more and more of these hymns and poems of place. Even now we are only on the threshold of that great age. But many who are young to-day will not have grown old before these things shall come to pass. To Indian hearts, Hindu and Mahomedan alike, high caste and lowly born, woman and man, there will be no symbol so holy as, firstly, their mother-land, and secondly, their city. The civic life will offer a conception as dear as that of family and home. The duties of citizenship will seem not less precious than those of *jati* and *samaj*. And the worship of place and sense of civic honour, dignity and happiness will bear their flowers in each individual soul.

N.

OUR UNITY IN DIVERSITY

It requires a foreign eye to catch the wonders of Indian solidarity. It was Englishmen who first saw that our unity was so great, and our ignorance of that unity so universal, that an immense harvest might be reaped from administering our affairs and taxing us, as a unit. In this sense, then, the lesson of our own unity has been taught us by English teachers. But we have now learnt that lesson. It is true that we do not yet know the steps by which we shall effectively assert it, we do not yet know

what is the road we are to tread in its progressive application, but we have gained a deep conviction, from which nothing can ever move us. The scales have fallen from our eyes, and we see and know that we are one. Those very surface-diversities of which it has been common to make much, have become in our own eyes now, but so many proofs of our unity. As in one of the higher organisms, no limb is a mere repetition of any other, but the whole is served in some special way by each, so here also, no one province duplicates or rivals the functions of any other. The Maharatta serves the Bengali and the Bengali the Maharatta, the Hindu and the Mohammedan find themselves complementary to one another, and the Punjabee and the Madrasi are both equally essential to the whole, in virtue of their mutual unlikeness, not their resemblances. It is by our unlikeness,—an unlikeness tempered, of course, by deep sympathy—that we serve one another, not by our similarities. The lower the organism the greater the multiplication of a given part; the more specialised is each limb and each organ. In humanity, not even two hands or two feet are exactly identical. With regard to nations, the requisites of unity are common place and common circumstances. A people who are one in home and one in interests, have no absolute need to speak a common language, or believe a common *mythos*, in order to realise their mutual cohesion. Questions of race and history are merely irrelevant, in face of the determination of a given group to become a nation. Much has to be remembered and much forgotten; but man can determine such things by his own will, and when, in addition, he possesses, as we in India do, an enormous mass of common and related *customs*, he stands already provided with an inexhaustible language for the expression of his national unity. Ours is the advantage that not merely all sects of Hinduism, but also all the peoples of Asia express themselves through certain characteristic modes in common. Fire to the European

is a convenience : to most Asiatics, sacred mystery. water to the European represents physical cleanliness : to Asiatics, it is the starting-point of a new life. The simplicity of the Asiatic environment is a quiver with mystic associations, vibrant with spiritual significance, and to these, Hindu and Moham-medan respond alike.

N.

A JAPANESE PAPER ON THE INDIAN STRUGGLE FOR SELF-RULE

The Japan Chronicle, one of the most important newspapers in Japan, published a remarkable leading article in its issue of December 17th, 1908, on "The Nationalist Party in India." Regarding India's fitness for self-government, the editor says :

The people of India, it is declared, are not fit for self-government. But it must be remembered that this is said by the holders of power, who, naturally do not want to surrender it ; who think, not entirely without reason, that they are the ablest rulers in the world and that their government is necessarily a blessing to any non-Christian race. Whether the assertion be true or not, it cannot be said to be impartial. But a nation cannot be treated as a child or a minor. The blacksmith in the story, when asked how he learned to make horse-shoes so fast and well, replied, "By making horse-shoes." In the same way, a nation cannot learn the use of liberty except by using liberty.

It is curious that the argument now used against granting self-government to the Indians on the ground that they could never unite, and that anarchy would be the result, was applied to the American colonies just before the establishment of American independence. In fact it would seem as if the conditions as to apparent fitness for freedom were no better there towards the end of the eighteenth century than they are, or are assumed to be, in India to-day. A contemporary writer, BURNABY, says :—

"Fire and water are not more heterogeneous than the different colonies in North America. Nothing can exceed the jealousy and emulation which they possess in regard to one another. The inhabitants of Pennsylvania and New York have an inexhaustible

source of animosity in their jealousy of the trade of the Jerseys... In short, such is the difference of character, of manners, of religion, of interest, of the different colonies that I think, if I am not wholly ignorant of the human mind, were they left to themselves, there would soon be a civil war from one end of the continent to the other, while the Indians and Negroes would, with better reason, impatiently watch the opportunity of exterminating them altogether."

Another contemporary, OTIS, writes :—

"Were these colonies left to themselves, to-morrow America would be a mere shamble of blood and confusion before little petty states could be settled."

And the historian LECKY says :—

"Great bodies of Dutch, Germans, French, Swedes, Scotch and Irish, scattered among the descendants of the English, contributed to the heterogeneous character of the colonies; and they comprised so many varieties of government, religious belief, commercial interest and social type that their union appeared to many incredible on the very eve of the Revolution."

Another point to be taken into consideration is that no nation at the present day stands alone; and that pressure from outside may produce cohesion just as well as an internal attractive force may. A nation will, in almost any circumstances of internal heterogeneity, act as a united whole when it understands that it is necessary for its existence to do so. The Japanese, for instance, are not essentially a united people: the whole course of their history until Tokugawa supremacy is one of constant internal quarrels and bloodshed, and even at the present day the clan spirit is very strong in their politics. But when, fifty years ago, the country came to realise its backward condition, it also recognised the absolute necessity for union if the lost opportunities were to be regained, and the result was that minor quarrels were shelved and the present even exaggerated importance came to be attached to unity and uniformity. An India which had attained its independence,.....would be subjected to similar influences. Union would not merely be "strength" to her, it would be a condition of existence. With European Powers always ready to aggress on weaker brethren, with an ambitious, expansive Japan for close neighbour, and with China growing stronger every day, India could not afford to be other than united.

The object of this pamphlet is to advocate Home Rule, not independence, which latter is at present beyond the range of practical constitutional politics. But for the attainment and preservation of Home Rule, too, India requires to be united; and all unprejudiced observers agree in thinking that India is at present more united than she was before.

OUR FITNESS FOR HOME RULE

Many Britishers think that we cannot have Home Rule, as we are not fit for it. They add that had we been fit, no power on earth could have prevented us from having Home Rule. Probably there is some confusion of thought here between the moral right to have a thing based on fitness for it and the organised strength to enforce that right, or in other words, between fitness for Home Rule and fitness for independence. When people are fit for independence, they do not argue about it; they simply win it—snatch it for themselves. But our present agitation is not for independence; we demand Home Rule. It means that we agree to remain within the British Empire and have internal autonomy. We have to convince the British people both that we are fit for it and that it is to their interest as well as ours to meet our wishes. Evidently then they can, up to a certain limit, stand in the way of our having Home Rule; they can refuse to be convinced. They may agree to our having Home Rule, either from a sense of political justice, or from the conviction that the British Empire cannot, in order to preserve its integrity, exert its full strength against foreign enemies unless India is given Home Rule. If circumstances have not yet arisen to produce this conviction, future events may produce it. We can only hope that the British people will be convinced sufficiently early for the British Empire to reap the advantages of Indian Home Rule. So far as we are concerned, we have not the least doubt that we are fit for Home Rule. Any non-Indian who brings a disinterested and unprejudiced mind to the consideration of the subject cannot but be convinced that we are right.

BRITISH CAPITALISTS AND INDIAN HOME RULE

The British Capitalists' great argument against Indian Home Rule is that if India has Home Rule, British capital, which has to a great extent brought about the development of India, will leave her shores; and India cannot do without British capital, nor can the capitalists forego the advantages of investment in India. Our reply is that so long as India remains a profitable field for British capital, it will not leave her; and there is no reason why Home Rule should bring about such utter anarchy as to make the investment of capital unremunerative and unsafe. China is not under British rule and it has recently undergone two revolutions, and yet British capital has not left China. On the contrary, Japanese capitalists assert that in that country English capitalists are their most powerful rivals. Can any sane man assert that India under British suzerainty and Indian Home Rule will be in a state of greater disorder and unsettlement than China during and after two bloody revolutions? If the British Government is sufficiently powerful to safeguard the rights and interests of British capital in foreign countries, all of them not quite efficiently governed, what reason is there to suppose that it will not be able to do so in India, a part of the British Empire, when she has Home Rule? There is British capital invested in the Indian States, governed mainly by Indian statesmen. India under Home Rule will not be under a worse government than the Indian States. Hence capital will be as safe there.

British capital may, then, threaten to leave India only because it may feel that under Home Rule it may not enjoy the unfair advantages which it now has, or it may leave us in order simply to

spite us. The latter contingency is unthinkable. As to the former, even if British capital ceases at any time to have any undue advantage here, a fair field will be sufficiently remunerative.

But if British capitalists are determined to give a wide berth to a self-ruling India, there is just a possibility of other rich nations investing their wealth here; for the investment of capital is not a branch of philanthropy. Capital will come wherever dividends can be earned. If the capital of all nations shun India, which is unlikely, why, we must manage to do without it, and be content to develop the country at a slow pace with our own small capital. That is far better than being exploited by foreign capitalists. The development of India by foreign capital has not been an unmixed blessing. If the worst comes to the worst and we be entirely without any capital even of our own, we shall revert to a primitive condition. The mineral wealth of India will remain in her mines, and her other resources remain untapped for a time. Home Rule will soon produce sufficient wealth for the development of the resources of the country, as has been the case with other countries.

British capitalists may be aware that their wealth was and is in great part of Indian origin, gained by warfare, exploitation and other means. India, which has made so many non-Indian peoples rich, cannot for ever languish for a lack of wealth of her own.

And may we in conclusion observe, what a sordid ideal it is which would condemn one fifth of the human race to bureaucratic subjection for an indefinite period in the pecuniary interests of some birds of passage! Burke deplored that the days of chivalry were gone. Where is there a second Burke to expose the chivalry of modern exploiters?

THE RATIONALE OF AUTONOMY

(Communicated to the First Universal Races Congress, 1911)

By JOHN M. ROBERTSON, M. P., *London.*

In most discussions on the demands by members of subject races for self-governing institutions, there appears to be little recognition either of the strength of the historic case for autonomy, or of the vital danger of its perpetual prevention. Perhaps this is in part due to the mode in which such claims are usually pressed. The mouthpieces or champions of the depressed races commonly, and naturally, make the appeal to their masters on grounds of abstract right and justice; and, when met by the reply, "You are not qualified to govern yourselves," they as naturally retort with an indictment of the governing faculty of the controlling power, and a claim to be equal in intelligence and civilisedness to other races who actually have attained autonomy. Thereafter the debate is apt to become a series of recriminations, the spokesmen of the ruling race using the language of contempt, and the other side the language of resentment.

Inasmuch as the handling of specific cases is apt to reopen such unprofitable disputes, it may be well to try to state the general case from the point of view of dispassionate political science, leaving for separate discussion the practical problems of method and initiation in given instances. To this end we have first to make clear the implications of the negative answer commonly given to the aspiring "native". It really amounts to confessing that all peoples who have not hitherto governed themselves are relatively undeveloped; that in short, self-government is the prerequisite of any high level of social organisation and general capacity. This implication, however, is not always avowed, even by the

more thoughtful exponents of "imperialism" in our own day; and until recent times it was rather the exception than the rule for historians even to note that when, in ancient Greece and Rome, an end was put to the life of free discussion and political conflict, the general level of human faculty began to sink. The truth that the habit of constant debate and the perpetual practice of affairs are the vital conditions of intellectual and moral betterment for communities as wholes, is still far short of being a current axiom. Yet it is proved alike by the decay of the classic civilisations after the ending of autonomy and by the advance of modern civilisation hand in hand with autonomy. And no great subtlety of analysis is needed to explain the necessity.

Even the strongest champions of the rule of advanced over backward races admit the evils of despotism: it is indeed one of the main pleas of British imperialists that British rule is better for those under it than the "native" despotism which would be the only alternative. Yet the same reasoners constantly avow the fallibility of British rulers; inasmuch as they mostly belong to one of two parties, of each of which the members habitually impeach alike the capacity and the good faith of those of the other. Unless, then, it is alleged that a man confessedly fallible in dealing with the members of his own advanced race becomes infallible when dealing with men whose language, ideals, and religion are alien to his, it follows that mistakes are made by all dominant races in their treatment of subject races.

Is it to be desired, then, that the latter should be either too unintelligent to know when they are misruled or too apathetic to care? The avowal of either desire would obviously amount to a complete condemnation of the ideal or polity involving it. Every polity professes to aim at betterment. But where there exist no means of correction or protest on the part of those who suffer by errors of government, there must be generated either apathetic

despair or a smouldering resentment. It would be gratuitously absurd to expect that the men of the "backward" race should be positively more patiently forgiving or more cheerfully tolerant than their "advanced" masters. If they can be so, they are the more "advanced" race of the two, in some of the main points of the capacity for self-rule. If, on the other hand, they are not to be either brutalised or prostrated, they must think and criticise; and, as John Stuart Mill long ago pointed out, efficient thinking cannot coexist with a settled belief—however acquired or imposed—in the entire beneficence of the ruler. To cognise beneficence there is needed judgment, reflection on experience; and absolute faith in the superior wisdom of the ruler would soon make an end of the very faculty of judging, by making an end of its exercise. An unexercised reason cannot subsist. In a word, if the ruled are to progress, they must think and judge, and if they think and judge they must from time to time be dissatisfied. There is no escape from the dilemma; and if the ruling race is at all conscientious, at all sincere in its professed desire for the betterment of its subjects, it must desire to know when and why they are dissatisfied. The need for reciprocity holds no less, albeit with a difference, in the case of the ruler. To exercise an absolute control over a community or a congeries of communities in the belief that one is absolutely infallible is to tread the path of insanity.

To know that one is politically fallible, and yet never to care for the opinion of those whom one may be at any moment misgoverning, is to set conscience aside. Either way, demoralisation or deterioration follows as inevitably for the ruler as for the ruled.

All history proclaims the lesson. Whether we take ancient despots ruling empires through satraps, or States playing the despot to other States, the sequence is infallibly evil. Never is there any continuity of sound life. In the absence of control from the governed, the despotisms invariably

grew corrupt and feeble. On the substitution of despotic rule for self-rule, all the forces of civilisation began to fail. The State Imperialism of Rome was even more utterly fatal than the personal imperialism of Alexander and his successors: it destroyed alike the primary power of self-defence and the higher life throughout nearly its whole sphere, till all Western civilisation sank in chaos and that of Byzantium survived in a state of mental stagnation only till as strong a barbarism assailed that as had overthrown the empire in the west. The domination of Florence over Pisa exhibited the fatality afresh; that of Spain over Italy had the same kind of double consequences; and the arbitrary rule of England over Scotland in the fourteenth century, and over France in the fifteenth, was similarly followed by periods of humiliation and decadence. It is only because of the much slighter implication of the national life in the remoter dominations of to-day that the harm is now so much less perceptible; the principle of harm can never be eliminated where the unsound relation subsists.

The contemporary problem may be put in a nutshell. Are the subject races of to-day progressing or not? If yes, they must be on the way, however slowly, to a measure of self-government. If not, the domination of the advanced races is a plain failure; and the talk of "beneficent rule" becomes an idle hypocrisy. The only possible alternative thesis is that the subject races are incapable of progress; and this is actually affirmed by some imperialists who reason that only in "temperate climates" do the natural conditions essential to self-government subsist. Their doctrine may be left to the acceptance of all who can find ground for exultation and magniloquence in the prospect of a perpetual dominion of white men over cowed coloured races who secretly and helplessly hate them, in lands where white men can never hope to rear their own offspring.

If, instead of a dreary fatalism of that description, there is urged upon us the simple difficulty of building

up a new social order in the tropical or semi-tropical lands where self-rule has never yet subsisted, and where mixture of races complicates every problem, we can at once assent. To plead difficulty is to admit desirability, and to confess that the perpetual absence of every element of political self-determination from a people's life means a failure of civilisation. Given that admission, difficulties may be faced in the spirit of good counsel.

But the first thing to be posited is a warning that "difficulty" and "ill-preparedness" are in no way special to the cases of tropical countries and so-called "backward" races. The critical process applied to these cases by those who commonly fall back on the formula of "unfitness" is extraordinarily imperfect. On their own view, those races are "fit" which have slowly attained self-government after starting on the journey at a notable low stage of "fitness," and undergoing on the way all manner of miscarriages, including civil war. Only by development out of unfitness, obviously, is fitness attainable. Yet the bare fact of unfitness is constantly posited as if it were the fixed antipodes of fitness. It is commonly put, for instance, as the decisive and final answer to any plea for the gradual development of self-governing institutions in India, that if India were evacuated by the British forces there would ensue civil war, if not a new war of conquest. That is of course an even superfluously valid argument against the evacuation of India, which no politician is known ever to have suggested. But it is put as if the bare potentiality were a demonstration of the unfitness of the Indian peoples collectively for any kind of institution tending ever so remotely towards autonomy. Now, within the English-speaking world, the mother-country had civil wars in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; there was civil war between mother-country and colonies towards the end of the eighteenth; and again within the independent United States and within Canada in the nineteenth—all this in a "race" that makes

specially high claims to self-governing faculty. On the imperialist principle, a Planetary Angel with plenary powers would have intervened to stop the "premature experiment" of Anglo-Saxon self-government at any one of the stages specified—if indeed he had ever allowed it to begin.

It would seem that a first step towards a scientific or even a quasi-rational view of the problem must be to put aside the instinctive hypothesis that faculty for self-government is a matter of "race". The people of the United States, who began their own independent life by civil war and revolution, and have had a civil war since, have been largely wont to join with those of the mother-country (whose history has included a round dozen of revolutions) in ascribing unfitness for self-rule to the South American Republics in general on the score of the number of revolutions in which they have indulged. Yet the South American State of Brazil has somehow contrived to solve peacefully the problem of slavery, which the United States could not solve without one of the most terrible civil wars in the world's history. Further, the South American State, after attaining republican government by a notably peaceful revolution, seems unhaunted by the shadow of a deadly Race Problem that dogs the Anglo-Saxon world in the North. It would seem that we must admit varieties of kind as well as degree in our conception of political fitness. In the middle of the nineteenth century, North Americans were found to impute unfitness for autonomy to the whole French people; and that people, after having undergone three revolutions within two generations of *the* Revolution, which was in itself a series of Revolutions, attained autonomy only after a cataclysm in which civil war followed upon a vast disaster in foreign war. To-day, however, probably no thoughtful person in either hemisphere disputes the fitness of France for autonomy, save in a remote philosophic sense in which fitness for autonomy may be denied to all peoples alike.

If the problem be reduced to its elements, in short, it will be found that none of the *a priori* arguments against autonomy for any race have any scientific validity. As a matter of fact, practical autonomy exists at this moment among the lowest and most retrograde races of the earth; and probably no experienced European administrator who has ever carried his thinking above the levels of that of a frontier trader will confidently say that any one of these races would be *improved* by setting up over them any system of white man's rule which has yet been tried. An extremely interesting experiment in white man's rule has been at work for a generation in Basutoland; but whatever may be its results, it seems likely to remain an isolated case.

The difficulties which stand in the way of autonomy for the leading subject-races consist—as apart from the simple unwillingness of many imperialists to proceed upon a road of reciprocity—in differences of social structure and external relations, not of mental or racial “character”; and much good might be done in promoting better feelings between rulers and ruled, if this were frankly and intelligently avowed by the former. When Japan has developed a large measure of constitutional autonomy and China is visibly moving on the same path, it is sufficiently idle to talk either of “Oriental” or of “hereditary” incapacity for self-government. The differentia for India are in terms of (a) multiplicity and (b) extreme disparity of races, involving liability to conquest (c) from within and (d) from without. When, again, Turkey and Persia alike have for the time attained autonomy by revolution, and Russia is moving theretowards by convulsion after convulsion in one vast protracted revolution, it is sufficiently idle to talk of “unpreparedness” in Egypt. The differentia for Egypt are in terms of (a) variety of alien elements installed on the spot and (b) incapacity on that as well as on other grounds for secure self-defence against conquest. If but Hindus and

Egyptians were rationally dealt in terms of these real considerations, to the exclusion of plainly fallacious and sophistical objections, the chances of a good understanding between dominator and dominated would be much improved.

The very first step in the discussion would mean a recognition of the fundamental "fitness" of self-controlling machinery for all races alike. Putting aside all the "sentiment" accruing to the concepts of "liberty" and "independence," both parties would have agreed that it is good for a man to be an intelligent agent instead of a recalcitrant machine and good for his controller likewise. Thereafter the problem would be one of determining from time to time exactly how far the relation of reciprocity can be developed between the controlling bureaucracy and controlled, to the end of setting up the state of mutual responsibility. The rational acceptance of a relation of primary obligation might be made easy to all "natives" capable of practical politics by showing them how the virtual self-government of Britain has been evolved, and subsists, under the assertion of a primary right and power of dominion, on the part of the sovereign.

Given such a point of departure, the educating of local modes of rational relation between controllers and controlled may go on through the centuries at a rather more rapid rate than marked the evolution in the case of the Anglo-Saxon race—provided only that the controllers possess the capacity for one thing. That is to say, they must have the capacity to adjust themselves to the relation of sovereign-race and self-asserting subjects as the actual sovereigns of the past *had* to do. "Liberties have been won by the peoples, thus far, either by convincing their arbitrary rulers that real power is after all in the hands of the majority, or by simply removing the rulers who could not admit it. In the case of dominant and subject races, where neither process is possible, the state of upward progress can be brought about only by substituting in the minds of the former a

sympathetic relation for one of mere adjustment of forces. The race in power must be concerned to keep pace with the evolving faculty of the race in tutelage, striking a careful balance at all times between the forces of aspiration and resistance which conflict in all Societies. But, above all, it must do this calmly and scientifically in face of the vituperation of the progressive section of the race in tutelage. And here lies the "great perhaps" of the political destinies of mankind.

Again, we may put the problem in a few words. In all autonomous countries political progress means constant friction and much embittered language between factions. To expect of the "backward" races that they shall be more considerate in their characterisation of the policies of their masters than those masters have ever been in their own faction-strifes, is plainly fantastic. It would seem no very great stretch of common sense to realise that when Liberal and Tory, for instance, habitually denounce each other's administration at home, they must look to having the administration of either or both denounced by those who have to endure it abroad. Yet the Briton can daily see in his newspapers the spectacle of journalists grossly vituperating their own Government in one column and in another denouncing as "sedition" all vituperation of it by Hindus. If this state of moral incoherence be not transcended by the majority of the ruling spirits, the problem of peaceful progress towards autonomy among the subject races is hopeless. The demand that the latter shall maintain an attitude of humble acquiescence for an indefinite time in the hope that when they have ceased to ask for anything they will spontaneously be given it is quite the most senseless formula ever framed in any political discussion. Peoples so acquiescent would be the most thoroughly unfit for self-government that have yet appeared. They would be no longer "viable".

As the case stands, the responsibility clearly lies on the races in power. If they cannot make the small

effort of self-criticism and consistency required to realise that they should tolerate blame from the races they dominate (since these can simply blame no one else for whatever misfortunes they endure), *and should still go on helping them forward*, the game is up.

In that case they will have failed to comprehend the necessary conditions of progress in the race relations in question ; and when the history of the failure comes to be written, it will not be upon the victims of the failure, probably, that posterity will think it worth while to pass the verdict of "unfitness." It will be passed, if upon any, on the race which, imputing unfitness to those whose fate it controlled, was itself collectively unfit for the task of conducting them on an upward path. Insisting on being their earthly Providence, it will have entitled them to curse it for all their troubles. And, boasting all the while of its supreme capacity, no less than of its high intentions, it will have earned from the dispassionate onlooker no claim to merciful judgment.

That there should occur such a bankruptcy of civilisation in respect of this one mode of relation between races while other relations are improving, seems, so to speak, unnecessary. The practical problem is certainly hard ; but then so are all great practical problems in politics. What is most disquieting so far is the lack of semblance of any general comprehension of the theoretic problem. The danger seems to be that the personalequation of the least thoughtful and most brutal sections of the dominant races will keep the question indefinitely on the primitive level. When whole classes and parties are found declaring that the subject race shall have no concessions made to it until it ceases to use insubordinate language, it becomes acutely clear to the investigator that we are still at the stage before science if not before morals. Obviously the thoroughly subordinate race will never have any "concessions" made to it: concessions are things asked for

and striven for. Does the dominator, then, suggest that he is improving a backward race by making it cultivate servility and hypocrisy? It is not his frequent complaint that those qualities are dangerously developed already? What would he have?

Let the imperialist once become morally consistent and we can usefully come to the practical problem. It is primarily one of education. The strongest theoretical case that could be made out against the plea for a measure of self-government in a subject race, would run somewhat thus: "Precisely because this race, as you argue, has not had the scrambling education gone through by our own, it cannot pass from complete subjection to any higher state. You admit that they cannot simply be let loose to begin with. Then they cannot have the needed preparation. The countries destined to self-government get there by walking on their own feet, with however many stumbles. Japan and Turkey may shake off their native absolutism and set up constitutionalism: they do it because they can. But for one race to give constitutionalism to another is a quite different thing. There is no case on record of even the attempt. Remember you will be giving it to a huge and heterogeneous population, many of whom do not even ask it, do not even dream of it."

Putting the counter case in that way, we answer that the argument from the past really begs the question. The fact that certain races have reached self-government through long endeavouring to stand alone, in the "natural" way of the growing child, does not mean that a nation or a congress of peoples long withheld from the given exercise of function can never *develop* it. There are superstitions in regard to evolution as in other matters; and history tells of change by initiation as well as by haphazard adaptation. If one born blind, or long blind, may be enabled by surgery to see, a race not bred to self-government may be enabled by example and institution to grow gradually into the practice of it. If Turkey and Japan, with an "Oriental" past, can of themselves enter upon

new life, races in tutelage may be inducted into it under guidance. And where unguided races have made the entrance by more or less spasmodic movements and with chronic friction and reaction, supervision may save others from the errors of ignorance.

Further, if only there be good-will on the part of the race in command, there is not more but less difficulty in the planned introduction of the rudiments of autonomy into any polity, however backward, than in the compassing of them by effort from within. Normally, the making of all the steps is by way of a fortuitous wrestle between progressive and reactionary forces equally impassioned: here it lies with the ruling races to prepare for and time the steps. The preparation lies in the conveyance of the two forms of universal knowledge—knowledge how to live and work in the present, and knowledge of the historic past and of other polities. It is in terms of their failure to undertake this essential schooling that all dominant races thus far stand convicted of mainly self-seeking relation to those in their power, all their protestations to the contrary notwithstanding.

Abstention from the task of education is confession either of fear or of indifference. Where it has never been undertaken, the charge of "unfitness" partakes of the nature of the indictment brought by the Wolf against the Lamb. The progress towards self-government began for our own race when other education was at a minimum. Let it be preceded for the backward races by such education as is within the competence of modern State machinery, and the old pretext of fitness will become impossible. Given the initial steps, progression of the ruled in the discipline of self-government will be seen by the ruling races to be progression in co-operation, and will be desired instead of being feared.

Towards irreconcilables the attitude of wise friends of the subject races will simply be that of sane politicians towards extremists in other countries. The fact of intransigence is just a fact

like another, one of the hundred variations in political outlook and bias which express the law of variation in all things. Aspiration or zeal without extremism has never occurred in any wide field of human life, and never till mankind has reached a very remote stage of equilibrium conceivably will. Whatever, then, may be its reaction, good or bad, on the totality of progress, extremism is literally a condition of progress in the sense of being inextirpable. What is to be hoped concerning it, in the cases under notice, is that there as well as in the history of other races there will take place the usual amount of conversion through stress of experience to more moderate ideals. And such conversion will quite certainly be easier when the controlling power is avowedly bent on promoting racial progress than when it is believed to be fundamentally hostile to all racial aspiration. For all extremism in politics the great prophylactic is steady progression. Those who would substitute for this conception that of a "one way to rule Orientals—force" are simply reviving for Orientals that blind denial of natural law which has meant so much strife for Occidentals in the past. They are the correlatives of the irreconcilables who demand instant "freedom"; and error for error, theirs is the worse.

HOME RULE AND THE SUPER-BRAHMANAS.

Whether in India or elsewhere, wherever it exists, the exclusive, monopolistic and arrogant caste-spirit is an evil. Every Brahmana is not an embodiment of this spirit, nor is every non-Brahmana

free from it. For, the Kshatriya, Vaisya, or Sudra who inveighs against the Brahmana, is not himself eager to inter-dine or intermarry with persons impiously considered "untouchable." The non-Brahmana movement of Madras cannot, therefore, be regarded as a crusade against the caste spirit.

If it were such a crusade, it would have been directed against the caste spirit as it exists among non-Brahmanas themselves, and among the British sojourners and Eurasian natives of India, too, who may be styled Super-Brahmanas and Semi-super-Brahmanas respectively. Brahmana exclusiveness and monopolism, where it exists, is mainly socio-religious in origin; whereas Super-Brahmana monopolism and exclusiveness is mainly socio-economico-political: that is the only difference. And, as a matter of fact, there is inter-dining, and even intermarriage, to a much greater extent between Brahmanas and non-Brahmanas, than among Super- and Semi-super-Brahmanas on the one hand and the people of India of purely indigenous origin on the other. (We mention it only as a fact, not because we advocate intermarriage between Indians on the one hand and Europeans and Eurasians on the other. Under present circumstances we are opposed to such marriages.) The non-Brahmana movement is, therefore, illogical in so far as it is only or mainly an anti-Brahmana movement. It ought to declare a crusade against class arrogance, monopoly, and exclusiveness, wherever found. A merely anti-Brahmana propaganda is mischievous.

I am for Home Rule, as it means democracy, which stands for equal opportunities for all. Some say, there cannot and ought not to be Home Rule in India, because and so long as there is caste in India. I say, there ought to be Home Rule in India because we have caste in our midst; for the spirit of democracy is sure to destroy touch-me-not-ism, and class arrogance, exclusiveness and monopolism. It is curious that many of those who inveigh against the

exclusiveness, arrogance and monopolism, where they exist, of the "higher" castes of India, are not equally outspoken in denouncing the caste spirit as it exists among the Super-Brahmanas and the Semi-super-Brahmanas, namely, the British sojourners and Eurasian natives of India. I support Home Rule, because it is the only means within the range of practical constitutional politics whereby a fair field may be secured to all, and Super-Brahmanas and others be deprived of injurious and exclusive privileges. I cannot understand how the addition of one more caste, viz., that of Super-and Semi-super-Brahmanas, can be a remedy for caste as it affects our civic and political life. Home Rule is the only remedy.